Catholic Allegiance

BX
830
1869
G53
GTU
Storage

KARL MORGAN BLOCK

Bishop of California

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION
LIBRARY
1962

KJ63
G543c
3640

Library of the
Church Divinity School
of the Pacific

Gaylord
PAMPHLET BINDER
Syracuse, N. Y.
Stockton, Calif.

New-York Tribune.

EXTRA, No. 25. 20 CENTS.

GLADSTONE'S PAMPHLET:

THE VATICAN DECREES.

C&S P

Hedge

REPLY BY ARCHBISHOP MANNING

AND

LORD ACTON'S LETTER.

THE WEEKLY TRIBUNE.

TO MAIL SUBSCRIBERS.

ne copy, one year—52 issues.....$2.00 | Five copies, one year—52 issues.....$7.50

) copies.....$1.25 each. | 30 copies.....$1.00 each.
) copies..... 1.10 each. | AND AN EXTRA TO EACH CLUB.

The Semi-Weekly Tribune.

ne copy, one year—104 numbers $3.00
ve copies, or over, for each copy 2.50
n copies (AND ONE EXTRA COPY) for..... .25.00

The Daily Tribune.

To Mail Subscribers.....$10 a year.

THE TRIBUNE ALMANAC for 1875, price 20 cents; 7 for $1.

(*Postage in all cases paid by* THE TRIBUNE.)

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

SCIENCE FOR THE PEOPLE.

THE TRIBUNE EXTRAS.

TYNDALL ON LIGHT.

AGASSIZ ON DEVELOPMENT.

PROCTOR ON ASTRONOMY.

BROWN-SÉQUARD ON THE NERVES.

HAMMOND ON ALCOHOL.

GLADSTONE ON THE VATICAN DECREES.

And a host of other authors, recognized foremost in science, art, literature, travel, history, and religious discussion. Among the names are, in addition to those already given, Dawson, Hi'gard, Lovering, Youmans, Elliott, Le Conte, Phillips, Godwin, Weiss, Bret Harte, "Mark Twain," Hayden, Whitney, Wheeler, Chrisʼ-lieb, Porter, Woolsey, and in fine, nearly all of the contemporaneous writers and thinkers, whose works the world is now reading.

Price, in Tribune sheet form, 10 cents each; in pamphlet, 20 cents. For a full list of the Tribune Extras and date, with details of the contents of each, see the columns of *The Tribune*, or send for a descriptive circular, which will be forwarded free to any address in the United States.

Address, **THE TRIBUNE, New York.**

How To Paint

A New Work by a **Practical Painter,** designed for the use of **Tradesmen, Mechanics, Merchants, Farmers,** and as a Guide to **Professional Painters.** Conta a Plain Common-Sense Statement of the Methods employed by Painters to produce satisfactory results in **Plain** and **Fancy Painting** of every description, including **Formulas** for **Mixing Paint** in **Oil** or **Water,** Tools required, etc. This is just the Book needed by any person having anything to paint, and makes

"EVERY MAN HIS OWN PAINTER."

Full Directions for Using **White Lead—Lamp-Black—Ivory Black—Prussian Blue—Ultramarine—Green—Yellow—Vermilion—Brown—Lake—Carmine—Whiting—Glue—Pumice Stone—Asphaltum** and **Spirits of Turpentine—Oils—Varnishes—Furniture Varnish—Milk Paint—Preparing Kalsomine—**

Paint for Outbuildings

—Whitewash—Paste for Paper-Hanging—Hanging Paper—Graining in **Oak, Maple, Mahogany, Rosewood, Black Walnut—Staining—Gilding—Bronzing—Transferring Decalcomanie—Making Rustic Pictures—Painting Flower-Stands—Mahogany Polish—Rosewood Polish—Varnishing Furniture—Waxing Furniture—Cleaning Paint—**

Paint for Farming Tools

—for Machinery—and for Household Fixtures.

To Paint a Farm Wagon

—to Re-Varnish a Carriage—to make Plaster Casts. The work is neatly printed, with illustrations wherever they can serve to make the subject plainer, and it will save **ten times** its cost yearly. Every family should possess a copy. Price by mail, postpaid, $1. Address

THE TRIBUNE,
NEW YORK.

HOLIDAY BOOKS.

PUBLISHED BY S. R. WELLS.

Cheap and Useful Presents, sent pre-paid by return of first post, at prices annexed.

Æsop's Fables Illustrated. The People's Pictorial Edition. With Seventy Splendid Illustrations. Tinted paper, beveled boards, $1.00.

Gems of Goldsmith, including "The Traveler;" "The Deserted Village," and "The Hermit." Full gilt, $1.00.

Pope's Essay on Man. With Notes. Beautifully Illustrated. Cloth, gilt. Best Ed., $1.00.

Hopes and Helps for the Young of Both Sexes on Formation of Character, Choice of Avocation, Health, Amusement, Music, Conversation, Cultivation of Intellect, Moral Sentiment, etc. $1.50.

"How to Write," "How to Talk," "How to Behave," and "How to Do Business. One large 12mo vol. INDISPENSABLE. $2.25.

Aims and Aids for Girls and Young Women, on the Duties of Life, Physical, Intellectual and Moral Development, Self-Culture, Dress, Fashion, Employment, Education, etc. $1.50.

Thoughts for the Young Men and the Young Women of America. By REAVIS. Ideal Men and Ideal Women. By HORACE GREELEY. $1

Inclose amount for one or all, and address

THE TRIBUNE, New York.

BOOKS BY HORACE GREELEY

RECOLLECTIONS OF A BUSY LIFE 2 Portraits and Appendix. Cloth, $3.00.
POLITICAL ECONOMY. Cloth, $1 50.
WHAT I KNOW OF FARMING. Cloth, $1.50.
Address,

THE TRIBUNE, New York

KJ63
G543c

The Tribune.

Lecture and Letter Extras. *No.* 25. *Pamphlet Edition—20 Cents*

[*This extra is reproduced in the present form in answer to the constant calls for such an edition; this form being suitable for convenient preservation, and yet cheap enough to admit of the widest popular circulation. The same matter can be had in the usual sheet form, for* 10 *cents, and will be sent by mail on receipt of price. Address, simply,*

THE TRIBUNE, *N. Y.*]

For a full list of THE TRIBUNE *extras—contents, prices, &c., see page* 32. *On receipt of the price of this extra,* 20 *cents, it will be sent free by mail.*

New-York Tribune.

FOUNDED BY HORACE GREELEY.

NEW-YORK, NOVEMBER, 1874.

THE GLADSTONE CONTROVERSY.

The great interest which has been aroused throughout the reading world by Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet, induces us to print it in full. Mere extracts from a work of such importance must be at best unsatisfactory. Our readers will wish to know, and will now have the opportunity of knowing, not only the substance of what Mr. Gladstone has said in question of the ability of Catholics to render full allegiance to the civil power, but all that he says on the subject. It is not a matter for hasty judgment, or to be presented piecemeal.

Every few years the world is shown, in ways more or less striking and picturesque, that for the statesman as much as for the priest, religion is the most important matter, as well in its practical as in its spiritual bearings, which can possibly engage the attention of men. It is naturally in its practical relations to life and government, rather than in its spiritual influence upon individuals, that it is most conspicuously and noisily important. What Mr. Gladstone believes in his own library of the nature and destiny of the human soul is a matter of infinite consequence to him now and hereafter, but what he thinks of the effects of the Vatican decrees upon English legislation, though these effects may be ever so remote or contingent, is enough to set the civilized world to discussing and quarreling about it. This is already the result of his pamphlet. There are great anger and confusion among the representatives of the Conservative party, which it is feared may receive some detriment from the controversy so suddenly opened. Among the Liberals there is a partial acceptance in theory of the propositions presented by their late leader, coupled with a somewhat positive assertion that no legislation is required against the evils set forth by him. But on all hands there is either an expression of surprise at the uselessness of the discussion, or an attempt to impute base motives to Mr. Gladstone for beginning it. We doubt if any one out of England will imagine that Mr. Gladstone was consciously influenced by any other motive than that of a sincere desire to throw light on what seemed to him a subject of paramount importance. This is a difficult thing for political people to admit in regard to an opponent, but it ought not to be so hard as usual in the case of Mr. Gladstone. He has often before imperiled his position of leadership by a stubborn conscientiousness, and it is not likely that in his declining years, when he has learned all that glory and power are worth, he should now begin to think more of his place and less of his conscience.

He has certainly accomplished one of the results which have probably formed part of his purpose. He has already developed a certain difference of opinion among the most prominent Catholics of England in regard to the binding nature of the Vatican decrees. Lord Acton has written a letter, the sentiment of which is that the decrees, so far as they infringe upon the civil allegiance of Catholics, are as null as if they did not exist. The Archbishop takes the almost opposite ground, in a circular letter addressed to the press of London that the Vatican decrees have in no particular changed the obligations of civil allegiance; and further, that "the civil allegiance of no "man is unlimited; and therefore the civil "allegiance of all men who believe in God or "are governed by conscience is in that sense "divided." Of course this affords a standing ground for every variety of faith according to the interpretation which may be put upon it. One man, in case of a conflict between Queen and Pope, may side with his sovereign, and another with the Pontiff, and each justify his action by this language of Archbishop Manning. The Archbishop speaks with great severity of Dr. von Döllinger as in great measure responsible for the "public and pri-"vate calamities visibly impending over Ger-"many;" from which it might be inferred that in a similar case, where a churchman's conscience coincided with the government against the Pope, Archbishop Manning would think such a conscience grievously disordered, and unworthy of trust.

CATHOLIC ALLEGIANCE.

FULL TEXT OF MR. GLADSTONE'S PAMPHLET ON THE VATICAN DECREES.

THE OCCASION OF THE TRACT—ROME'S POLICY ONE OF VIOLENCE AND CHANGE OF FAITH—ALLEGIANCE TO THE POPE A SACRIFICE OF MORAL AND MENTAL FREEDOM AND CIVIL LOYALTY AND DUTY—MODERN THOUGHT AND ANCIENT HISTORY EQUALLY REPUDIATED IN HER TEACHINGS.

I. THE OCCASION AND SCOPE OF THIS TRACT.

In the prosecution of a purpose not polemical but pacific I have been led to employ words which belong, more or less, to the region of religious controversy; and which, though they were themselves few, seem to require, from the various feelings they have aroused, that I should carefully define, elucidate and defend them. The task is not of a kind agreeable to me; but I proceed to perform it. Among the causes which have tended to disturb and perplex the public mind in the consideration of our own religious difficulties one has been a certain alarm at the aggressive activity and imagined growth of the Roman Church in this country. All are aware of our susceptibility on this side; and it was not, I think, improper for one who desires to remove everything that can interfere with a calm and judicial temper, and who believes the alarm to be groundless, to state pointedly, though briefly, some reasons for that belief.

Accordingly I did not scruple to use the following language in a paper inserted in the number of the *Contemporary Review* for the month of October. I was speaking of "the question whether a handful of the clergy are or are not engaged in an utterly hopeless and visionary effort to Romanize the Church and people of England."

At no time since the bloody reign of Mary has such a scheme been possible. But if it had been possible in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries, it would still have become impossible in the nineteenth: when Rome has substituted for the proud boast of *semper eadem* a policy of violence and change in faith; when she has refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused; when no one can become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another; and when she has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history.*

Had I been, when I wrote this passage, as I now am, addressing myself in considerable measure to my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen I should have striven to avoid the seeming roughness of some of these expressions; but as the question is now about their substance, from which I am not in any particular disposed to recede, any attempt to recast their general form would probably mislead. I proceed, then, to deal with them on their merits.

More than one friend of mine among those who have been led to join the Roman Catholic communion has made this passage the subject, more or less, of expostulation. Now, in my opinion, the assertions which it makes are, as coming from a layman who has spent most and the best years of his life in the observation and practice of politics, not aggressive, but defensive.

It is neither the abettors of the Papal Chair, nor any one who, however far from being an abettor of the Papal Chair, actually writes from a Papal point of view, that has a right to remonstrate with the world at large; but it is the world at large, on the contrary, that has the fullest right to remonstrate, first with his Holiness, secondly with those who share his proceedings, thirdly even with such as passively allow and accept them.

I, therefore, as one of the world at large, propose to expostulate in my turn. I shall strive to show to such of my Roman Catholic fellow-subjects as may kindly give me a hearing that, after the singular steps which the authorities of their Church have in these last years thought fit to take, the people of this country, who fully believe in their loyalty, are entitled on purely civil grounds to expect from them some declaration or manifestation of opinion in reply to that ecclesiastical party in their Church who have laid down, in their name, principles adverse to the purity and integrity of civil allegiance.

Undoubtedly my allegations are of great breadth. Such broad allegations require a broad and a deep foundation. The first question which they raise is, Are they, as to the material part of them, true? But even their truth might not suffice to show that their publication was opportune. The second question, then which they raise is, Are they, for any practical purpose, material? And there is yet a third, though a minor, question, which arises out of the propositions in connection with their authorship, Were they suitable to be set forth by the present writer?

To these three questions I will now set myself to reply. And the matter of my reply will, as I conceive, constitute and convey an appeal to the understandings of my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen which I trust that, at the least, some among them may deem not altogether unworthy of their consideration.

From the language used by some of the organs of Roman Catholic opinion, it is, I am afraid, plain that in some quarters they have given deep offense. Displeasure, indignation, even fury, might be said to mark the language which in the heat of the moment has been expressed here and there. They have been hastily treated as an attack made upon Roman Catholics generally, nay, as an insult offered them. It is obvious to reply that of

*Contemporary Review, October, 1874, p. 674.

Roman Catholics generally they state nothing. Together with a reference to "converts," of which I shall say more, they constitute generally a free and strong animadversion on the conduct of the Papal Chair, and of its advisers and abettors. If I am told that he who animadverts upon these assails thereby, or insults, Roman Catholics at large, who do not choose their ecclesiastical rulers, and are not recognized as having any voice in the government of their Church, I cannot be bound by or accept a proposition which seems to me to be so little in accordance with reason.

Before all things, however, I should desire it to be understood that, in the remarks now offered, I desire to eschew not only religious bigotry, but likewise theological controversy. Indeed, with theology, except in its civil bearing, with theology as such, I have here nothing whatever to do. But it is the peculiarity of Roman theology that, by thrusting itself into the temporal domain it naturally and even necessarily comes to be a frequent theme of political discussion. To quiet-minded Roman Catholics it must be a subject of infinite annoyance that their religion is, on this ground more than any other the subject of criticism; more than any other, the occasion of conflicts with the State and of civil disquietude. I feel sincerely how much hardship their case entails. But this hardship is brought upon them altogether by the conduct of the authorities of their own Church. Why did theology enter so largely into the debates of Parliament on Roman Catholic Emancipation? Certainly not because our statesmen and debaters of fifty years ago had an abstract love of such controversies, but because it was extensively believed that the Pope of Rome had been and was a trespasser upon ground which belonged to the civil authority, and that he affected to determine by spiritual prerogative questions of the civil sphere. This fact, if fact it be, and not the truth or falsehood, the reasonableness or unreasonableness, of any article of purely religious belief, is the whole and sole cause of the mischief. To this fact, and to this fact alone, my language is referable; but for this fact it would have been neither my duty nor my desire to use it. All other Christian bodies are content with freedom in their own religious domain. Orientals, Lutherans, Calvinists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Nonconformists, one and all, in the present day, contentedly and thankfully accept the benefits of civil order; never pretend that the State is not its own master; make no religious claims to temporal possessions or advantages; and, consequently, never are in perilous collision with the State. Nay more, even so I believe it is with the mass of Roman Catholics individually. But not so with the leaders of their Church, or with those who take pride in following the leaders. Indeed, this has been made matter of boast:

> There is not another Church so called (than the Roman), nor any community professing to be a Church, which does not submit, or obey, or hold its peace, when the civil governors of the world command.—"The Present Crisis of the Holy See," by H. E. Manning, D. D. London, 1861. p. 75.

The Rome of the middle ages claimed universal monarchy. The modern Church of Rome has abandoned nothing, retracted nothing. Is that all? Far from it. By condemning (as will be seen) those who, like Bishop Doyle in 1826,* charge the mediæval Popes with aggression, she unconditionally, even covertly, maintains what the mediæval Popes maintained. But even this is not the worst. The worst by far is that whereas, of the national churches and communities in the middle ages, there was a brisk, vigorous, and constant opposition to these outrageous claims, an opposition which stoutly asserted its own orthodoxy, which always caused itself to be respected, and which even sometimes gained the upper hand; now, in this nineteenth century of ours, and while it is growing old, this same opposition has been put out of court and judicially extinguished within the Papal Church, by the recent decrees of the Vatican. And it is impossible for persons accepting those decrees justly to complain, when such documents are subjected in good faith to a strict examination as respects their compatibility with civil right and the obedience of subjects.

In defending my language, I shall carefully mark its limits. But all defense is reassertion, which properly requires a deliberate reconsideration; and no man who thus reconsiders should scruple, if he find so much as a word that may convey a false impression, to amend it. Exactness in stating truth according to the measure of our intelligence, is an indispensible condition of justice, and of a title to be heard.

My propositions, then, as they stood, are these:

1. That "Rome has substituted for the proud boast of *semper eadem*, a policy of violence and change in faith."

2. That she has refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused.

3. That no one can now become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another.

4. That she (Rome) has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history.

II. THE FIRST AND THE FOURTH PROPOSITIONS.

Of the first and fourth of these propositions I shall dispose rather summarily, as they appear to belong to the theological domain. They refer to a fact, and they record an opinion. One fact to which they refer is this: that, in days within my memory, the constant, favorite, and imposing argument of Roman controversialists was the unbroken and absolute identity in belief of the Roman Church from the days of our Savior until now. No one, who has at all followed the course of this literature

*Lords' Committee, March 18, 1826. Report, p. 190.

during the last forty years, can fail to be sensible of the change in its present tenor. More and more have the assertions of continuous uniformity of doctrine receded into scarcely penetrable shadow. More and more have another series of assertions, of a living authority, ever ready to open, adopt, and shape Christian doctrine according to the times, taken their place. Without discussing the abstract compatibility of these lines of argument, I note two of the immense practical differences between them. In the first, the office claimed by the Church is principally that of a witness to facts; in the second, principally that of a judge, if not a revealer, of doctrine. In the first, the processes which the Church undertakes are subject to a constant challenge and appeal to history; in the socond, no amount of historical testimony can avail against the unmeasured power of the theory of development. Most important, most pregnant considerations, these, at least for two classes of persons: for those who think that exaggerated doctrines of Church power are among the real and serious dangers of the age; and for those who think that against all forms, both of superstition and of unbelief, one main preservative is to be found in maintaining the truth and authority of history, and the inestimable value of the historic spirit.

So much for the fact: as for the opinion, that the recent Papal decrees are at war with modern thought, and that, purporting to enlarge the necessary creed of Christendom, they involve a violent breach with history, this is a matter unfit for me to discuss, as it is a question of Divinity, but not unfit for me to have mentioned in my article, since the opinion given there is the opinion of those with whom I was endeavoring to reason—namely, the great majority of the British public.

If it is thought that the word violence was open to exception, I regret I cannot give it up. The justification of the ancient definitions of the Church, which have endured the storms of 1,500 years, was to be found in this, that they were not arbitrary or willful, but that they wholly sprang from, and related to theories rampant at the time, and regarded as menacing to Christian belief. Even the Canons of the Council of Trent have in the main this amount, apart from their matter, of presumptive warrant. But the decrees of the present perilous Pontificate have been passed to favor and precipitate prevailing currents of opinion in the ecclesiastical world of Rome. The growth of what is often termed among Protestants Mariolatry, and of belief in Papal Infallibility, was notoriously advancing, but it seems not fast enough to satisfy the dominant party. To aim the deadly blows of 1854* and 1870 at the old historic, scientific, and moderate school was surely an act of violence; and with this censure the proceeding of 1870 has actually been visited by the first living theologian now within the Roman Communion. I mean Dr. John Henry Newman, who has used these significant words, among others, "Why should an agressive and insolent faction be allowed to make the heart of the just sad whom the Lord hath not made sorrowful?"*

* Decree of the Immaculate Conception.

III. THE SECOND PROPOSITION.

I take next my second proposition: that Rome has refurbished, and paraded anew, every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused.

Is this then a fact, or is it not?

I must assume that it is denied; and therefore I cannot wholly pass by the work of proof. But I will state in the fewest possible words, and with references, a few propositions, all the holders of which have been condemned by the See of Rome during my own generation, and especially within the last 12 or 15 years. And, in order that I may do nothing toward importing passion into what is matter of pure argument, I will avoid citing any of the fearfully energetic epithets in which the condemnations are sometimes clothed.

1. Those who maintain the liberty of the Press Encyclical Letter of Pope Gregory XVI. in 1831; and of Pope Pius IX. in 1864.

2. Or the liberty of conscience and of worship. Encyclical of Pius IX., December 8, 1864.

3. Or the liberty of speech. "Syllabus" of March 18, 1861. Prop. lxxix. Encyclical of Pope Pius IX., December 8, 1864.

4. Or who contend that Papal judgments and decrees may, without sin, be disobeyed, or differed from, unless they treat of the rules (*dogmata*) of faith or morals. Ibid.

5. Or who assign to the State the power of defining the civil rights (*jura*) and province of the Church. "Syllabus" of Pope Pius IX., March 8, 1861. Ibid. Prop. xix.

6. Or who hold that Roman Pontiffs and Œcumenical Councils have transgressed the limits of their power, and usurped the rights of princes. Ibid. Prop. xxiii.

(It must be borne in mind that "Œcumenical Councils here mean Roman Councils not recognized by the rest of the Church. The Councils of the early Church did not interfere with the jurisdiction of the civil power.)

7. Or that the Church may not employ force. (*Ecclesia vis inferendæ potestatem non habet*). "Syllabus," Prop, xxiv.

8. Or that power, not inherent in the office of the Episcopate, but granted to it by the civil authority, may be withdrawn from it at the discretion of that authority. Ibid. Prop. xxv.

9. Or that the (*immunitas*) civil immunity of the Church and its ministers depends upon civil right. Ibid. Prop. xxx.

* See the remarkable letter of Dr. Newman to Bishop Ullathorne, in *The Guardian* of April 6, 1870,

10. Or that in the conflict of laws, civil and ecclesiastical, the civil law should prevail. Ibid. Prop. xlii.

11. Or that any method of instruction of youth, solely secular, may be approved. Ibid. Prop. xlviii.

12. Or that knowledge of things philosophical and civil may and should decline to be guided by Divine and ecclesiastical authority. Ibid. Prop. lvii.

13. Or that marriage is not in its essence a sacrament. Ibid. Prop. lxvi.

14. Or that marriage not sacramentally contracted (*si sacramentum excludatur*) has a binding force. Ibid. Prop. lxxiii.

15. Or that the abolition of the Temporal Power of the Popedom would be highly advantageous to the Church. Ibid. Prop. lxxvi. Also lxx.

16. Or that any other religion than the Roman religion may be established by a State. Ibid. Prop. lxxvii.

17. Or that in "countries called Catholic" the free exercise of other religions may laudably be allowed. "Syllabus." Prop. lxxviii.

18. Or that the Roman Pontiff ought to come to terms with progress, liberalism, and modern civilization. Ibid. Prop. lxxx. (For the original passages from the Encyclical and Syllabus of Pius IX., see Appendix A.)

This list is now, perhaps, sufficiently extended, although I have as yet not touched the decrees of 1870. But, before quitting it, I must offer three observations on what it contains.

Firstly: I do not place all the propositions in one and the same category; for there are a portion of them which, as far as I can judge, might, by the combined aid of favorable construction and vigorous explanation, be brought within bounds. And I hold that favorable construction of the terms used in controversies is the right general rule. But this can only be so when construction is an open question. When the author of certain propositions claims, as in the case before us, a sole and unlimited power to interpret them in such manner and by such rules as he may from time to time think fit, the only defense for all others concerned is at once to judge for themselves, how much of unreason or of mischief the words, naturally understood, may contain.

Secondly: It may appear upon a hasty perusal that neither the infliction of penalty in life, limb, liberty, or goods, on disobedient members of the Christian Church, nor the title to depose sovereigns and release subjects from their allegiance, with all its revolting consequences, has been here reaffirmed. In terms, there is no mention of them; but in the substance of the propositions, I grieve to say, they are beyond doubt included. For it is notorious that they have been declared and decreed by "Rome"—that is to say, by Popes and Papal Councils; and the stringent condemnations of the Syllabus include all those who hold that Popes and Papal Councils (declared œcumenical) have transgressed the just limits of their power, or usurped the rights of princes. What have been their opinions and decrees about persecution I need hardly say, and indeed the right to employ physical force is even here undisguisedly claimed (No. 7).

Even while I am writing I am reminded, from an unquestionable source, of the words of Pope Pius IX. himself on the deposing power. I add only a few italics; the words appear as given in a translation, without the original:

The present Pontiff used these words in replying to the address from the Academia of the Catholic Religion (July 21, 1873):

"There are many errors regarding the Infallibility: but the most malicious of all is that which includes, in that dogma, the *right* of deposing sovereigns, and declaring the people no longer bound by the obligation of fidelity. This *right* has now and again, in critical circumstances, been exercised by the Pontiffs; but it has nothing to do with Papal Infallibility. Its origin was not the infallibility, but the authority of the Pope. This authority, in accordance with public right, which was then vigorous, and with the acquiescence of all Christian nations, who reverenced in the Pope the supreme Judge of the Christian Commonwealth, extended so far as to pass judgment, even in civil affairs, on the acts of princes and of nations."*

Lastly, I must observe that these are not mere opinions of the Pope himself, nor even are they opinions which he might paternally recommend to the pious consideration of the faithful. With the promulgation of his opinions is unhappily combined, in the Encyclical Letter, which virtually, though not expressly, includes the whole, a command to all his spiritual children (from which command we the disobedient children are in no way excluded) to hold them.

(*A*) Itaque omnes et singulas pravas opiniones et doctrinas singillatim hisce literis commemoratas auctoritate nostra Apostolica reprobamus, proscribimus, atque, damnamus; easque ab omnibus Catholicæ Ecclesiæ filiis veluti reprobatas, proscriptas, atque damnatas omnino haberi volumus et mandamus. Encycl. Dec. 8, 1864.

And the decrees of 1870 will presently show us, what they established as the binding force of the mandate thus conveyed to the Christian world.

IV.—THE THIRD PROPOSITION.

I now pass to the operation of these extraordinary declarations on personal or private duty.

When the cup of endurance which had so long been filling, began, with the Council of the Vatican in 1870, to overflow, the most learned living theologian of the Roman communion, Dr. von Döllinger, long the foremost champion of his Church, refused compliance, and submitted, with his temper undisturbed and his freedom unimpaired, to the extreme and most painful penalty of excommunication. With him, many of the most learned and respected theologians of the Roman communion in Germany underwent the same sentence. The very few, who elsewhere (I do not speak of Switzerland) suffered in like manner, deserve an admiration rising in proportion to their fewness. It seems as though Germany, from which Luther blew the mighty trumpet that even now echoes through the land, still retained her primacy in the

---

*"Civilization and the See of Rome." By Lord Robert Montagu, Dublin, 1874. A lecture delivered under the auspices of the Catholic Union of Ireland. I have a little misgiving about the version, but not of a nature to affect the substance.

domain of conscience, still supplied the *centuria prærogativa* of the great *comitia* of the world.

But let no man wonder or complain. Without imputing to any one the moral murder—for such it is—of stifling conscience and conviction, I for one cannot be surprised that the fermentation, which is working through the mind of the Latin Church, has as yet (elsewhere than in Germany) but in few instances come to the surface. By the mass of mankind, it is morally impossible that questions such as these can be adequately examined; so it ever has been, and so in the main will it continue, until the principles of manufacturing machinery shall have been applied, and with analogous results to intellectual and moral processes. Followers they are and must be, and in a certain sense ought to be. But what as to the leaders of society, the men of education and of leisure? I will try to suggest some answer in few words. A change of religious profession is under all circumstances a great and awful thing. Much more is the question, however, between conflicting, or apparently conflicting, duties, arduous, when the religion of a man has been changed for him, over his head, and without the very least of his participation. Far be it then from me to make any Roman Catholic, except the great hierarch c Power, and those who have egged it on, responsible for the portentous proceedings which we have witnessed. My conviction is that, even of those who may not shake off the yoke, multitudes will vindicate at any rate their loyalty at the expense of the consistency, which perhaps in difficult matters of religion few among us perfectly maintain. But this belongs to the future; for the present nothing could, in my opinion, be more unjust than to hold the members of the Roman Church in general already responsible for the recent innovations. The duty of observers, who think the claims involved in these decrees arrogant and false, and such as not even impotence, real or supposed, ought to shield from criticism, is frankly to state the case, and, by way of friendly challenge, to entreat their Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen to replace themselves in the position which, five-and-forty years ago, this nation, by the voice and action of its Parliament, declared its belief that they held.

Upon a strict reëxamination of the language as apart from the substance of my fourth proposition, I find it faulty, inasmuch as it seems to imply that a "convert" now joining the Papal Church, not only gives up certain rights and duties of freedom, but surrenders them by a conscious and deliberate act. What I have less accurately said that he renounced, I might have more accurately said that he forfeited. To speak strictly, the claim now made upon him by the authority, which he solemnly and with the highest responsibility acknowledges, requires him to surrender his mental and moral freedom, and to place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another. There may have been, and may be persons who in their sanguine trust will not shrink from this result, and will console themselves with the notion that their loyalty and civil duty are to be committed to the custody of one much wiser than themselves. But I am sure that there are also "converts" who, when they perceive, will by word and act reject, the consequences which relentless logic draws for them. If, however, my proposition be true, there is no escape from the dilemma. Is it then true, or is it not true, that Rome requires a convert, who now joins her, to forfeit his moral and mental freedom, and to place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another?

In order to place this matter in as clear a light as I can, it will be necessary to go back a little upon our recent history.

A century ago we began to relax that system of penal laws against Roman Catholics, at once pettifogging, base, and cruel, which Mr. Burke has scathed and blasted with his immortal eloquence.

When this process had reached the point at which the question was whether they should be admitted into Parliament, there arose a great and prolonged national controversy; and some men, who at no time of their lives were narrow-minded, such as Sir Robert Peel, the Minister, resisted the concession. The arguments in its favor were obvious and strong, and they ultimately prevailed. But the strength of the opposing party had lain in the allegation that, from the nature and claims of the Papal power, it was not possible for the consistent Roman Catholic to pay to the Crown of this country an entire allegiance, and that the admission of persons thus self-disabled to Parliament was inconsistent with the safety of the State and nation, which had not very long before, it may be observed, emerged from a struggle for existence.

An answer to this argument was indispensable; and it was supplied mainly from two sources. The Josephine laws,* then still subsisting in the Austrian Empire, and the arrangements which had been made after the peace of 1815 by Prussia and the German States with Pius VII. and Consalvi, proved that the Papal Court could submit to circumstances, and could allow material restraints even upon the exercise of its ecclesiastical prerogatives. Here, then, was a reply in the sense of the phrase *solvitur ambulando.* Much information of this class was collected for the information of Parliament and the country.† But there were also measures taken to learn, from the highest Roman Cath-

* See the work of Count dal Pozzo on the "Austrian Ecclesiastical Law." London: Murray, 1827. The Leopoldine Laws in Tuscany may also be mentioned.

† See "Report from the Select Committee appointed to report the nature and substance of the Laws and Ordinances existing in Foreign States respecting the regulation of their Roman Catholic subjects in Ecclesiastical Matters, and their intercourse with the See of Rome, or any other Foreign Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction." Printed for the House of Commons in 1816 and 1817. Reprinted 1851.

olic authorities of this country, what was the exact situation of the members of that communion with respect to some of the better known exorbitancies of Papal assumption. Did the Pope claim any temporal jurisdiction? Did he still pretend to the exercise of a power to depose kings, release subjects from their allegiance, and incite them to revolt? Was faith to be kept with heretics? Did the Church still teach the doctrines of persecution? Now, to no one of these questions could the answer really be of the smallest immediate moment to this powerful and solidly compacted kingdom. They were topics selected by way of sample; and the intention was to elicit declarations showing generally that the fangs of the medieval Popedom had been drawn, and its claws torn away; that the Roman system, however strict in its dogma, was perfectly compatible with civil liberty, and with the institutions of a free State molded on a different religious basis from its own.

Answers in abundance were obtained, tending to show that the doctrines of deposition and persecution, of keeping no faith with heretics, and of universal dominion, were obsolete beyond revival; that every assurance could be given respecting them, except such as require the shame of a formal retracation; that they were in effect mere burglars, unworthy to be taken into account by a nation, which prided itself on being made up of practical men.

But it was unquestionably felt that something more than the renunciation of these particular opinions was necessary in order to secure the full concession of civil rights to Roman Catholics. As to their individual loyalty, a State disposed to generous or candid interpretation had no reason to be uneasy. It was only with regard to requisitions, which might be made on them from another quarter, that apprehension could exist. It was reasonable that England should desire to know not only what the Pope* might do for himself, but to what demands, by the constitution of their Church, they were liable; and how far it was possible that such demands could touch their civil duty. The theory which placed every human being in things spiritual, and things temporal, at the feet of the Roman Pontiff had not been an *idolum specus*, a mere theory of the chamber. Brain-power never surpassed in the political history of the world had been devoted for centuries to the single purpose of working it into the practice of Christendom; had in the West achieved for an impossible problem a partial success; and had in the East punished the obstinate independence of the Church by that Latin conquest of Constantinople, which effectually prepared the way for the downfall of the Eastern Empire, and the establishment of the Turks in Europe. What was really material, therefore, was, not whether the Papal Chair laid claim to this or that particular power, but whether it laid claim to some power that included them all, and whether that claim had received such sanction from the authorities of the Latin Church, that there remained within her borders absolutely no tenable standing-ground from which war against it could be maintained. Did the Pope then claim infallibility? Or did he, either without infallibility or with it (and, if with it, so much the worse), claim an universal obedience from his flock? And were these claims, either or both, affirmed in his Church by authority which even the least Papal of the members of that Church must admit to be binding upon conscience?

The first two of these questions were covered by the third; and well it was that they were so covered, for to them no satisfactory answer could even then be given. The Popes had kept up, with comparatively little intermission, for well nigh a thousand years their claim to dogmatic infallibility; and had, at periods within the same tract of time, often enough made, and never retracted, that other claim which is theoretically less but practically larger; their claim to an obedience virtually universal from the baptized members of the Church. To the third question it was fortunately more practicable to prescribe a satisfactory reply. It was well known that, in the days of its glory and intellectual power, the great Gallican Church had not only not admited, but had denied, Papal infallibility, and had declared that the local laws and usuages of the Church could not be set aside by the will of the Pontiff. Nay, further, it was believed that in the main these had been, down to the close of the last century, the prevailing opinions of the Cisalpine Churches in communion with Rome. The Council of Constance had in act as well as word shown that the Pope's judgments, and the Pope himself, were triable by the assembled representatives of the Christian world. And the Council of Trent, notwithstanding the predominance in it of Italian and Roman influences, if it had not denied, yet had not affirmed either proposition.

All that remained was to know what were the sentiments entertained on these vital points by the leaders and guides of Roman Catholic opinion nearest to our own doors. And here testimony was offered, which must not and cannot be forgotten. In part this was the testimony of witnesses before the Committee of the House of Lords in 1825. I need quote two answers only, given by the Prelate, who more than any other respresented his Church, and influenced the mind of this country in favor of concession at the time, namely, Bishop Doyle. He was asked: *

* At that period the eminent and able Bishop Doyle did not scruple to write as follows: "We are taunted with the proceedings of Popes. What, my Lord, have we Catholics to do with the proceedings of Popes, or why should we be made accountable for them?"—[Essay on the Catholic Claims. To Lord Liverpool, 1826, p. 111.

* Committees of both Lords and Commons sat; the former in 1825, the latter in 1824-5. The References were identical, and ran as follows: "To inquire into the state of Ireland, more particularly with reference to the circumstances which may have led to disturbances in that part of the United Kingdom." Bishop Doyle was examined March 21, 1825, and April 21, 1825, before the Lords.

In what and how far does the Roman Catholic profess to obey the Pope?

He replied:

The Catholic professes to obey the Pope in matters which regard his religious faith, and in those matters of ecclesiastical discipline which have already been defined by the competent authorities.

And again:

Does that justify the objection that is made to Catholics, that their allegiance is divided?

I do not think it does in any way. We are bound to obey the Pope in those things that I have already mentioned. But our obedience to the law, and the allegiance which we owe the sovereign, are complete, and full, and perfect, and undivided, inasmuch as they extend to all political, legal, and civil rights of the King or of his subjects. I think the allegiance due to the King and the allegiance due to the Pope are as distinct and as divided in their nature as any two things can possibly be.

Such is the opinion of the dead prelate. We shall presently hear the opinion of a living one. But the sentiments of the dead man powerfully operated on the open and trustful temper of this people to induce them to grant, and at the cost of so much popular feeling and national traditions, the great and just concession of 1829. That concession, without such declarations, it would, to say the least, have been far more difficult to obtain.

Now, bodies are usually held to be bound by the evidence of their own selected and typical witnesses. But in this instance the colleagues of those witnesses thought fit also to speak collectively.

First let us quote from the collective "Declaration," in the year 1826, of the Vicars Apostolic, who, with Episcopal authority, governed the Roman Catholics of Great Britain.

The allegiance which Catholics hold to be due, and are bound to pay, to their Sovereign, and to the civil authority of the State is perfect and undivided. . . . .

They declare that neither the Pope nor any other prelate or ecclesiastical person of the Roman Catholic Church . . has any right to interfere, directly or indirectly, in the civil government, ... nor to oppose in any manner the performance of the civil duties which are due to the King.

Not less explicit was the Hierarchy of the Roman Communion in its "Pastoral Address to the Clergy and Laity of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland," dated Jan. 25, 1823. This address contains a declaration, from which I extract the following words:

It is a duty which they owe to themselves, as well as to their Protestant fellow-subjects, whose good opinion they value, to endeavor once more to remove the false imputations that have been frequently cast upon the faith and discipline of that Church which is intrusted to their care, that all may be enabled to know with accuracy their genuine principles.

In Article II.:

They declare on oath their belief that it is not an article of the Catholic Faith, neither are they thereby required to believe that the Pope is infallible.

And, after various recitals, they set forth:

After this full, explicit, and sworn declaration, we are utterly at a loss to conceive on what possible ground we could be justly charged with bearing toward our most gracious Sovereign only a divided allegiance.

Thus, besides much else which I will not stop to quote, Papal infallibility was most solemnly declared to be a matter on which each man might think as he pleased; the Pope's power to claim obedience was strictly and narrowly limited: it was expressly denied that he had any title, direct or indirect, to interfere in civil government. Of the right of the Pope to define the limits which divide the civil from the spiritual by his own authority, not one word is said by the prelates of either country.

Since that time, all these propositions have been reversed! The Pope's infallibility, when he speaks *ex cathedra* on faith and morals, has been declared, with the assent of the bishops of the Roman Church, to be an article of faith, binding on the conscience of every Christian; his claim to the obedience of his spiritual subjects has been declared in like manner without any practical limit or reserve; and his supremacy, without any reserve of civil rights, has been similarly affirmed to include everything which relates to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world. And these doctrines, we now know on the highest authority, it is of necessity for salvation to believe.

Independently, however, of the Vatican Decrees themselves, it is necessary for all who wish to understand what has been the amount of the wonderful change now consummated in the constitution of the Latin Church, and what is the present degradation of its Episcopal order, to observe also the change, amounting to revolution, of form in the present, as compared with other conciliatory decrees. Indeed, that spirit of centralization, the excesses of which are as fatal to vigorous life in the Church as in the State, seems now nearly to have reached the last and furthest point of possible advancement and exaltation.

When, in fact, we speak of the decrees of the Council of the Vatican, we use a phrase which will not bear strict examination. The Canons of the Council of Trent were, at least, the real canons of a real council; and the strain in which they are promulgated is this: *Hæc sacrosancta, ecumenica, et generalis Tridentina Synodus, in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata in ea præsidentibus eisdem tribus apostolicis Legatis, hortatur*, or *docet*, or *statuit*, or *decernit*, and the like; and its canons, as published in Rome, are "*Canonoes et decreta Sacrosancti ecumenici Concilii Tridentini*" ('Romæ: in Collegio urbano de Propagandâ Fide.' 1833), and so forth. But what we have now to do with is the *Constitutio Dogmatica Prima de Ecclesia Christi, edita in Sessione tertia* of the Vatican Council. It is not a constitution made by the Council, but one promulgated in the Council.* And who is it that legislates and decrees? It is *Pius Episcopus, servus servorum Dei:* and the seductive plural of his *docemus et declaramus* is simply the dignified and ceremonious "We" of Royal declarations. The document is dated *Pontificatus nostri*

* I am aware that, as some hold, this was the case with the Council of the Lateran in A. D. 1215. But, first, this has not been established; secondly, the very gist of the evil we are dealing with consists in following (and enforcing) precedents from the age of Pope Innocent III.

Anno XXV.: and the humble share of the assembled episcopate in the transaction is represented by *sacro approbante concilio*. And now for the propositions themselves.

First comes the Pope's infallibility:

(*B*) "Docemus, et divinitus revelatum dogma esse definimus, Romanum Pontificem, cum ex Cathedra loquitur, id est cum, omnium Christianorum Pastoris et Doctoris munere fungens, pro suprema sua Apostolica auctoritate doctrinam de fide vel moribus ab universa Ecclesia tenendam definit, per assistentiam divinam, ipsi in Beato Petro promissam, ea infallibilitate pollere, quâ Divinus Redemptor Ecclesiam suam in definiendâ doctrinâ de fide vel moribus instructam esse voluit: ideoque ejus Romani Pontificis definitiones ex sese non autem ex consensu Ecclesiæ irreformabiles esse" (Constitutio de Ecclesia, c. iv.)

Will it, then, be said that the infallibilty of the Pope accrues only when he speaks *ex cathedra?* No doubt this is a very material consideration for those who have been told that the private conscience is to derive comfort and assurance from the emanations of the Papal Chair: for there is no established or accepted definition of the phrase *ex cathedra*, and he has no power to obtain and no guide to direct him in his choice among some twelve theories on the subject, which, it is said, are bandied to and fro among Roman theologians, except the dispised and discarded agency of his private judgment. But while thus sorely tantalized, he is not one whit protected. For there is still one person, and one only, who can unquestionably declare *ex cathedra* what is *ex cathedra* and what is not, and who can declare it when and as he pleases. That person is the Pope himself. The provision is, that no document he issues shall be valid without a seal, but the seal remains under his own sole lock and key.

Again, it may be sought to plead, that the Pope is, after all, only operating by sanctions which unquestionably belong to the religious domain. He does not propose to invade the country, to seize Woolwich, or burn Portsmouth. He will only, at the worst, excommunicate opponents, as he has excommunicated Dr. von Döllinger and others. Is this a good answer? After all, even in the Middle Ages, it was not by the direct action of fleets and armies of their own that the Popes contended with kings who were refractory; it was mainly by interdicts, and by the refusal, which they entailed when the bishops were not brave enough to refuse their publication, of religious offices to the people. It was thus that England suffered under John, France under Philip Augustus, Leon under Alphonso the Noble, and every country in its turn. But the inference may be drawn that they who, while using spiritual weapons for such an end do not employ temporal means, only fail to employ them because they have them not. A religious society, which delivers volleys of spiritual censure in order to impede the performance of civil duties, does all the mischief that is in its power to do, and brings into question, in the face of the State, its title to civil protection.

Will it be said, finally, that the Infallibility touches only matter of faith and morals? Only matter of morals! Will any of the Roman casuists kindly acquaint us what are the departments and functions of human life which do not and cannot fall within the domain of morals? If they will not tell us, we must look elsewhere. In his work entitled "Literature and Dogma" (pages 15, 44) Mr. M. Arnold quaintly informs us—as they tell us nowadays how many parts of our poor bodies are solid and how many aqueous—that about 57 per cent of all we do belongs to the department of "conduct." Conduct and morals, we may suppose, are nearly coextensive. Three-fourths, then, of life are thus handed over. But who will guarantee to us the other fourth? Certainly not St. Paul, who says, "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God." And, "Whatsoever ye do, in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus." I Cor., x., 31; Col., iii., 7.) No! Such a distinction would be the unworthy device of a shallow policy, vainly used to hide the daring of that wild ambition which at Rome, not from the throne but from behind the throne, prompts the movements of the Vatican. I care not to ask if there be dregs or tatters of human life, such as can escape from the description and boundary of morals. I submit that duty is a power which rises with us in the morning, and goes to rest with us at night. It is coextensive with the action of our intelligence. It is the shadow which cleaves to us go where we will, and which only leaves us when we leave the light of life. So, then, it is the supreme direction of us in respect to all duty, which the Pontiff declares to belong to him, *sacro approbante concilio;* and this declaration he makes, not as an otiose opinion of the schools, but *cunctis fidelibus credendam et tenendam.*

But we shall now see that even if a loophole had at this point been left unclosed, the void is supplied by another provision of the decrees. While the reach of the Infallibility is as wide as it may please the Pope, or those who may prompt the Pope, to make it, there is something wider still, and that is the claim to an absolute and entire obedience. This obedience is to be rendered to his orders in the cases I shall proceed to point out, without any qualifying condition, such as the ex cathedra. The sounding name of Infallibility has so fascinated the public mind, and riveted it on the fourth chapter of the Constitution de Ecclesia, that its near neighbor the Third Chapter, has, at least in my opnion, received very much less than justice. Let us turn to it:

(*C*) Cujuscunque ritus et dignitatis pastores atque fideles, tam seorsum singuli quam simul omnes, officio hierarchicæ subordinationis veræque obedientiæ obstringuntur, non solum in rebus quæ ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis, quæ ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiæ per totum orbem diffusæ pertinent. . . . . Hæc est Catholicæ veritatis doctrina, a qua deviare, salva fide atque salute, nemo potest. . . .

Docemus etiam et declaramus eum esse judicem supremum fidelium, et in omnibus causis ad examen ecclesiasticum spectantibus ad ipsius posse judicium recurri: Sedis vero Apostolicæ, cujus auctoritate major

non est, judicium a nemine fore retractandum. Neque cuiquam de ejus licere judicare judicio.*

Even, therefore, where the judgments of the Pope do not present the credentials of infallibility, they are unappealable and irreversible, no person may pass judgment upon them, and all men, clerical and lay, dispersedly or in the aggregate, are bound truly to obey them; and from this rule of Catholic truth no man can depart, save at the peril of his salvation. Surely, it is allowable to say that this Third Chapter on universal obedience is a formidable rival to the Fourth Chapter on Infallibility. Indeed, to an observer from without, it seems to leave the dignity to the other, but to reserve the stringency and efficiency to itself. The third chapter is the Merovingian Monarch; the fourth is the Carolingian Mayor of the Palace. The third has an overawing splendor; the fourth, an iron gripe. Little does it matter to me whether my superior claims infallibility, so long as he is entitled to demand and exact conformity. This, it will be observed, he demands even in cases not covered by his infallibility; cases, therefore, in which he admits it to be possible that he may be wrong, but finds it intolerable to be told so. As he must be obeyed in all his judgments, though not *ex cathedra*, it seems a pity he could not likewise give the comforting assurance that they are all certain to be right.

But why this ostensible reduplication, this apparent surplusage? Why did the astute contrivers of this tangled scheme conclude that they could not afford to rest content with pledging the Council to Infallibility in terms which arse not only wide to a high degree, but elastic beyond all measure?

Though they must have known perfectly well that "faith and morals" carried everything, or everything worth having, in the purely individual sphere, they also knew just as well that, even where the individua was subjugated, they might and would still have to deal with the State.

In mediæval history this distinction is not only clear, but glaring. Outside the borders of some narrow and proscribed sect, now and then emerging, we never, or scarcely ever, hear of private and personal resistance to the Pope. The manful "Protestantism" of mediæval times had its activity almost entirely in the sphere of public, national, and state rights. Too much attention, in my opinion, cannot be fastened on this point. It is the very root and kernel of the matter. Individual servitude, however abject, will not satisfy the party now dominant in the Latin Church—the State must also be a slave.

Our Savior had recognized as distinct the two provinces of the civil rule and the Church; had nowhere intimated that the spiritual authority was to claim the disposal of physical force, and to control in its own domain the authority which is alone responsible for external peace, order, and safety among civilized communities of men. It has been alike the peculiarity, the pride, and the misfortune of the Roman Church, among Christian communities, to allow to itself an unbounded use, as far as its power would go, of earthly instruments for spiritual ends. We have seen with what ample assurances (see further, Appendix B) this nation and Parliament were fed in 1826; how well and roundly the full and undivided rights of the civil power and the separation of the two jurisdictions were affirmed. All this had at length been undone, as far as Popes could undo it, in the Syllabus and the Encyclical. It remained to complete the undoing, through the subserviency or pliability of the Council.

And the work is now truly complete. Lest it should be said that supremacy in faith and morals, full dominion over personal belief and conduct, did not cover the collective action of men in states, a third province was opened, not indeed to the abstract assertion of infallibility, but to the far more practical and decisive demand of absolute obedience. And this is the proper work of the third chapter, to which I am endeavoring to do a tardy justice. Let us listen again to its few but pregnant words on the point:

Non solum in rebus, quæ ad fidem et mores, sed etiam in iis, quæ ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiæ per totum orbem diffusæ pertinent.

Absolute obedience, it is boldly declared, is due to the Pope, at the peril of salvation, not alone in faith, in morals, but in all things which concern the discipline and government of the Church. Thus are swept into the Papal net whole multitudes of facts, whole systems of government, prevailing though in different degrees, in every country of the world. Even in the United States, where the severance between Church and State is supposed to be complete, a long catalogue might be drawn of subjects belonging to the domain and competency of the State, but also undeniably affecting the government of the Church; such as, by way of example, marriage, burial, education, prison discipline, blasphemy, poor relief, incorporation, mortmain, religious endowments, vows of celibacy and obedience. In Europe the circle is far wider, the points of contact and of interlacing almost innumerable. But on all matters, respecting which any Pope may think proper to declare that they concern either faith, or morals, or the government, or discipline of the Church, he claims, with the approval of a Council undoubtedly Œcumenical in the Roman sense, the absolute obedience, at the peril of salvation of every member of his communion.

It seems not as yet to have been thought wise to pledge the Council in terms to the Syllabus and the Encyclical. That achievement is probably reserved for some one of its sittings yet to come. In the mean time it is well to remember that this claim in respect of all things affecting the discipline and government of the

---

Dogmatic Constitutions, &c., c. iii. Dublin, 1870, pp. 30-32.

Church, as well as faith and conduct, is lodged in open day by and in the reign of a Pontiff who has condemned free speech, free writing, a free press, toleration of nonconformity, liberty of conscience, the study of civil and philosophical matters in independence of the ecclesiastical authority, marriage unless sacramentally contracted, and the definition by the State of the civil rights (*jura*) of the Church; who has demanded for the Church, therefore, the title to define its own civil rights, together with a divine right to civil immunities, and a right to use physical force; and who has also proudly asserted that the Popes of the Middle Ages with their councils did not invade the rights of princes; as for example, Gregory VII., of the Emperor Henry IV.; Innocent III., of Raymond of Toulouse; Paul III., in deposing Henry VIII.; or Pius V., in performing the like paternal office for Elizabeth.

I submit, then, that my fourth proposition is true; and that England is entitled to ask, and to know, in what way the obedience required by the Pope and the Council of the Vatican is to be reconciled with the integrity of civil allegiance.

It has been shown that the Head of their Church, so supported as undoubtedly to speak with its highest authority, claims from Roman Catholics a plenary obedience to whatever he may desire in relation, not to faith but to morals, and not only to these, but to all that concerns the government and discipline of the Church; that of this much lies within the domain of the State; that, to obviate all misapprehension, the Pope demands for himself the right to determine the province of his own rights, and has so defined it in formal documents as to warrant any and every invasion of the civil sphere; and that this new version of the principles of the Papal Church inexorably binds its members to the admission of these exorbitant claims, without any refuge or reservation on behalf of their duty to the Crown.

Under circumstances such as these, it seems not too much to ask of them to confirm the opinion which we, as fellow-countrymen, entertain of them, by sweeping away, in such manner and terms as they may think best, the presumptive imputations which their ecclesiastical rulers at Rome, acting autocratically, appear to have brought upon their capacity to pay a solid and undivided allegiance; and to fulfill the engagement which their bishops, as political sponsors, promised and declared for them in 1825.

It would be impertinent, as well as needless, to suggest what should be said. All that is requisite is to indicate in substance that which (if the foregoing argument be sound) is not wanted and that which is. What is not wanted is vague and general assertion, of whatever kind and however sincere. What is wanted, and that in the most specific form and clearest terms, I take to be one of two things—that is to say, either.

I. A demonstration that neither in the name of faith, nor in the name of morals, nor in the name of the government or discipline of the Church, is the Pope of Rome able, by virtue of the powers asserted for him by the Vatican decree, to make any claim upon those who adhere to his communion of such a nature as can impair the integrity of their civil allegiance; or else,

II. That, if and when such claim is made, it will, even although resting on the definitions of the Vatican, be repelled and rejected, just as Bishop Doyle, when he was asked what the Roman Catholic clergy would do if the Pope intermeddled with their religion, replied frankly, "The consequence would be that we should oppose him by every means in our power, even by the exercise of our spiritual authority."—[Report, March 18, 1836, p. 191.

In the absence of explicit assurances to this effect, we should appear to be led, nay, driven, by just reasoning upon that documentary evidence, to the conclusions:

1. That the Pope, authorized by his Council, claims for himself the domain (*a*) of faith, (*b*) of morals, (*c*) of all that concerns the government and discipline of the Church.

2. That he in like manner claims the power of determining the limits of those domains.

3. That he does not sever them, by any acknowledged or intelligible line, from the domains of civil duty and allegiance.

4. That he therefore claims, and claims from the month of July, 1870, onward with plenary authority, from every convert and member of his church, that he shall "place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another:" that other being himself.

V. BEING TRUE, ARE THE PROPOSITIONS MATERIAL?

But next, if these propositions be true, are they also material? The claims cannot, as I much fear, be denied to have been made. It cannot be denied that the Bishops, who govern in things spiritual more than five millions (or nearly one-sixth) of the inhabitants of the United Kingdom have in some cases promoted, in all cases accepted, these claims. It has been a favorite purpose of my life not to conjure up, but to conjure down, public alarms. I am not now going to pretend that either foreign foe or domestic treason can, at the bidding of the Court of Rome, disturb these peaceful shores. But though such fears may be visionary, it is more visionary still to suppose for one moment that the claims of Gregory VII., of Innocent III., and of Boniface VIII., have been disinterred, in the nineteenth century, like hideous mummies picked out of Egyptian sarcophagi, in the interests of archæology, or without a definite and practical aim. As rational beings, we must rest assured that only with a very clearly conceived and foregone purpose have these astonishing reassertions been paraded before the world. What is that purpose?

I can well believe that it is in part theological. There have always been, and there still are, no small proportion of our race, and those by no means in all respects the worst, who are sorely open to the temptation, especially in times of religious disturbance, to discharge their spiritual responsibilities by power of attorney. As advertising houses find custom in proportion, not so much to the solidity of their resources as to the magniloquence of their premises and assurances, so theological boldness in the extension of such claims is sure to pay, by widening certain circles of devoted adherents, however it may repel the mass of mankind. There were two special encouragements to this enterprise at the present day: one of them the perhaps unconscious but manifest leaning of some, outside the Roman precinct, to undue exaltation of Church power; the other the reaction which is and must be brought about in favor of superstition by the levity of the destructive speculations so widely current, and the notable hardihood of the anti-Christian writing of the day.

But it is impossible to account sufficiently in this manner for the particular course which has been actually pursued by the Roman Court. All morbid spiritual appetites would have been amply satisfied by claims to infallibility in creed, to the prerogative of miracle, to dominion over the unseen world. In truth there was occasion, in this view, for nothing except a liberal supply of Salmonean thunder—

Dum flammas Jovis, et sonitus imitatur Olympi.

(Æn. vi., 586.) All this could have been managed by a few Tetzels judiciously distributed over Europe. Therefore the question still remains, why did that court, with policy forever in its eye, lodge such formidable demands for power of the vulgar kind in that sphere which is visible, and where hard knocks can undoubtedly be given as well as received?

It must be for some political object of a very tangible kind that the risks of so daring a raid upon the civil sphere have been deliberately run.

A daring raid it is. For it is most evident that the very assertion of principles which establish an exemption from allegiance, or which impair its completeness, goes, in many other countries of Europe, far more directly than with us, to the creation of political strife and to dangers of the most material and tangible kind. The struggle now proceeding in Germany at once occurs to the mind as a palmary instance. I am not competent to give any opinion upon the particulars of that struggle. The institutions of Germany and the relative estimate of State power and individual freedom are materially different from ours. But I must say as much as this: Firstly, it is not Prussia alone that is touched; elsewhere, too, the bone lies ready, though the contention may be delayed. In other States, in Austria particularly, there are recent laws in force raising much the same issues as the Falck laws have raised. But the Roman Court possesses in perfection one art, the art of waiting; and it is her wise maxim to fight but one enemy at a time. Secondly, if I have truly represented the claims promulgated from the Vatican, it is difficult to deny that those claims, and the power which has made them, are primarily responsible for the pains and perils, whatever they may be, of the present conflict between German and Roman enactments. And that which was once truly said of France may now also be said with not less truth of Germany: when Germany is disquieted Europe cannot be at rest.

I should feel less anxiety on this subject had the Supreme Pontiff frankly recognized his altered position since the events of 1870; and, in language as clear, if not as emphatic, as that in which he has proscribed modern civilization, given to Europe the assurance that he would be no party to the reëstablishment by blood and violence of the Temporal Power of the Church. It is easy to conceive that his personal benevolence, no less than his feelings as an Italian, must have inclined him individually toward a course so humane; and I should add, if I might do it without presumption, so prudent. With what appears to an English eye a lavish prodigality, successive Italian Governments have made over the ecclesiastical powers and privileges of the monarchy, not to the Church of the country for the revival of the ancient, popular, and self-governing elements of its constitution, but to the Papal Chair, for the establishment of ecclesiastical despotism and the suppression of the last vestiges of independence. This course, so difficult for a foreigner to appreciate or even to justify, has been met, not by reciprocal conciliation, but by a constant fire of denunciations and complaints. When the tone of these denunciations and complaints is compared with the language of the authorized and favored Papal organs in the press, and of the Ultramontane party (now the sole legitimate party of the Latin Church) throughout Europe, it leads many to the painful and revolting conclusion that there is a fixed purpose among the secret inspirers of Roman policy to pursue, by the road of force, upon the arrival of any favorable opportunity, the favorite project of reërecting the terrestrial throne of the Popedom, even if it can only be reërected on the ashes of the city and amid the whitening bones of the people. (Appendix C.)

It is difficult to conceive or contemplate the effects of such an endeavor. But the existence at this day of the policy, even in bare idea, is itself a portentous evil. I do not hesitate to say that it is an incentive to general disturbance—a premium upon European wars. It is, in my opinion, not sanguine only, but almost ridiculous to imagine that such a project could eventually succeed; but it is difficult to over-estimate the effect which it might produce in generating and exasperating strife. It might even to some extent disturb and paralyze the

action of such Governments as might interpose for no separate purpose of their own, but only with a view to the maintenance or restoration of the general peace. If the baleful power which is expressed by the phrase *Curia Romana*, and not at all adequately rendered in its historic force by the usual English equivalent, "Court of Rome," really entertains the scheme, it doubtless counts on the support in every country of an organized and devoted party, which, when it can command the scales of political power, will promote interference, and when it is in a minority, will work for securing neutrality. As the peace of Europe may be in jeopardy, and as the duties of England, as one (so to speak) of its constabulary authorities, might come to be in question, it would be most interesting to know the mental attitude of our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen in England and Ireland with reference to the subject, and it seems to be one on which we are entitled to solicit information.

For there cannot be the smallast doubt that the temporal power of the Popedom comes within the true meaning of the words used at the Vatican to describe the subjects on which the Pope is authorized to claim, under awful sanctions, the obedience of the "faithful." It is even possible that we have here the key to the enlargement of the province of Obedience beyond the limits of Infallibility, and to the introduction of the remarkable phrase *ad disciplinam et regimen Ecclesiæ*. No impartial person can deny that the question of the temporal power very evidently concerns the discipline and government of the Church—concerns it, and most mischievously as I should venture to think; but in the opinion, up to a late date, of many Roman Catholics, not only most beneficially, but even essentially. Let it be remembered that such a man as the late Count Montalembert, who, in his general politics was of the Liberal party, did not scruple to hold that the millions of Roman Catholics throughout the world were copartners with the inhabitants of the States of the Church in regard to their civil government; and as constituting the vast majority, were, of course, entitled to override them. It was also rather commonly held, a quarter of a century ago, that the question of the States of the Church was one with which none but Roman Catholic powers could have anything to do. This doctrine, I must own, was to me at all times unintelligible. It is now, to say the least, hopelessly and irrecoverably obsolete.

Archbishop Manning, who is the head of the Papal Church in England, and whose ecclesiastical tone is supposed to be in the closest accordance with that of his headquarters, has not thought it too much to say that the civil order of all Christendom is the offspring of the Temporal Power, and has the Temporal Power for its keystone; that on the destruction of the Temporal Power "the laws of nations would at once fall in ruins;" that (our old friend) the deposing power "taught subjects obedience and princes clemency."—["Three Lectures on the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes," 1860, pp. 34, 46, 47, 58-9, 63.] Nay, this high authority has proceeded further; and has elevated the Temperal Power to the rank of necessary doctrine.

The Catholic Church cannot be silent, it cannot hold its peace; it cannot cease to preach the doctrines of Revelation, not only of the Trinity and of the Incarnation, but likewise of the Seven Sacraments, and of the Infallibility of the Church of God, and of the necessity of Unity, and of the Sovereignty, both spiritual and temporal, of the Holy See.*

I never for my own part, heard that the work containing this remarkable passage was placed in the "Index Prohibitorum Librorum." On the contrary, its distinguished author was elevated, on the first opportunity, to the headship of the Roman Episcopacy in England, and to the guidance of the million or thereabouts of souls in its communion. And the more recent utterances of the oracle have not descended from the high level of those already cited. They have, indeed, the recommendation of a comment, not without fair claims to authority, on the recent declarations of the Pope and the Council, and of one which goes to prove how far I am from having exaggerated or strained in the foregoing pages the meaning of those declarations. Especially does this hold good on the one point, the most vital of the whole—the title to define the border line of the two provinces, which the Archbishop not unfairly takes to be the true criterion of supremacy, as between rival powers like the Church and the State.

If, then, the civil power be not competent to decide the limits of the spiritual power, and if the spiritual power can define, with a divine certainty, its own limits, it is evidently supreme. Or, in other words, the spiritual power knows, therefore, the limits and the competence of the civil power. It is thereby, in matters of religion and conscience, supreme. I do not see how this can be denied without denying Christianity. And if this be so, this is the doctrine of the Bull *Unam Sanctam*,† and of the Syllabus, and of the Vatican Council. It is, in fact, Ultramontanism, for this term means neither less nor more. The Church, therefore, is separate and supreme.

Let us then ascertain, somewhat further, what is the meaning of supreme. Any power which is independent, and can alone fix the limits of its own jurisdiction, and can therefore fix the limits of all other jurisdictions is, *ipso facto*, supreme.‡ But the Church of Jesus Christ, within the sphere of revelation, of faith, and morals, is all this, or is nothing, or worse than nothing, an imposture and a usurpation—that is, it is Christ or Antichrist.‖

But the whole pamphlet should be read by those who desire to know the true sense of the Papal declaration and Vatican decrees, as they are understood by the most favored ecclesiastics; understood, I am bound to own, so far as I can see, in their natural, legitimate, and inevitable sense. Such readers will be assisted by the treatise in seeing clearly and in admitting frankly that, whatever demands may hereafter, and in whatever cir-

---

*The present crisis of the Holy See.—[By R. E. Manning, D. D. London. 1861, p. 73.

†On the Bull *Unam Sanctam* "of a most odious kind;' see Bishop Doyle's Essay, already cited. He thus describes it.

‡The italics are not in the original.

‖ "Cæsarism and Ultramontanism." By Archbishop Manning, 1874, pp. 35-6.

cumstances, be made upon us, we shall be unable to advance with any fairness the plea that it has been done without due notice.

There are millions upon millions of the Protestants of this country who would agree with Archbishop Manning, if he were simply telling us that Divine truth is not to be sought from the lips of the State, nor to be sacrificed at its command. But those millions would tell him in return that the State, as the power which is alone responsible for the external order of the world, can alone conclusively and finally be competent to determine what is to take place in the sphere of that external order.

I have shown, then, that the propositions, especially that which has been felt to be the chief one among them, being true, are also material; material to be generally known, and clearly understood, and well considered, on civil grounds; inasmuch as they invade at a multitude of points the civil sphere, and seem even to have no very remote or shadowy connection with the future peace and security of Christendom.

VI.—WERE THE PROPOSITIONS PROPER TO BE SET FORTH BY THE PRESENT WRITER?

There remains yet before us only the shortest and least significant portion of the inquiry, namely, whether these things, being true, and being material to be said, were also proper to be said by me. I must ask pardon if a tone of egotism be detected in this necessarily subordinate portion of my remarks.

For 30 years, and in a great variety of circumstances, in office and as an independent member of Parliament, in majorities and in small minorities, and during the larger portion of the time * as the representative of a great constituency, mainly clerical, I have, with others, labored to maintain and extend the civil rights of my Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen. The Liberal party of this country, with which I have been commonly associated, has suffered, and sometimes suffered heavily, in public favor and in influence, from the belief that it was too ardent in the pursuit of that policy; while at the same time it has always been in the worst odor with the Court of Rome in consequence of its (I hope) unalterable attachment to Italian liberty and independence. I have sometimes been the spokesman of that party in recommendations which have tended to foster in fact the imputation I have mentioned, though not to warrant it as a matter of reason. But it has existed in fact. So that while (as I think) general justice to society required that these things which I have now set forth should be written, special justice, as toward the party to which I am loyally attached, and which I may have had a share in thus placing at a disadvantage before our countrymen, made it, to say the least, becoming that I should not shrink from writing them.

* From 1847 to 1865 I sat for the University of Oxford.

In discharging that office, I have sought to perform the part not of a theological partisan, but simply of a good citizen; of one hopeful that many of his Roman Catholic friends and fellow-countrymen, who are, to say the least of it, as good citizens as himself, may perceive that the case is not a frivolous case, but one that merits their attention.

I will next proceed to give the reason why, up to a recent date, I have thought it right in the main to leave to any others who might feel it the duty of dealing in detail with this question.

The great change which seems to me to have been brought about in the position of Roman Catholic Christians as citizens reached its consummation and came into full operation in July, 1870, by the proceedings or so-called decrees of the Vatican Council.

Up to that time, opinion in the Roman Church on all matters involving civil liberty, though partially and sometimes widely intimidated, was free wherever it was resolute. During the Middle Ages, heresy was often extinguished in blood, but in every Cisalpine country a principle of liberty, to a great extent, held its own, and national life refused to be put down. Nay more, these precious and inestimable gifts had not infrequently for their champions a local prelacy and clergy. The Constitutions of Clarendon, cursed from the Papal throne, were the work of the English Bishops. Stephen Langton, appointed directly, through an extraordinary stretch of power, by Innocent III., to the See of Canterbury, headed the Barons of England in extorting from the Papal minion John, the worst and basest of all our sovereigns, that Magna Charta, which the Pope at once visited with his anathemas. In the reign of Henry VIII., it was Tunstal, Bishop of Durham, who first wrote against the Papal domination. Tunstal was followed by Gardiner; and even the recognition of the Royal Headship was voted by the clergy, not under Cranmer, but under his unsuspected predecessor Warham. Strong and domineering as was the high Papal party in those centuries, the resistance was manful. Thrice in history it seemed as if what we may call the Constitutional party in the Church was about to triumph; first, at the epoch of the Council of Constance; secondly, when the French Episcopate was in conflict with Pope Innocent XI.; thirdly, when Clement XIV. leveled with the dust the deadliest foes that mental and moral liberty have ever known. But from July, 1870, this state of things has passed away, and the death-warrant of that Constitutional party has been signed and sealed, and promulgated in form.

Before that time arrived, although I had used expressions sufficiently indicative as to the tendency of things in the great Latin Communion, yet I had for very many years felt it to be the first and paramount duty of the British Legislature, whatever Rome might say or do, to

give to Ireland all that justice could demand in regard to matters of conscience and of civil equality, and thus to set herself right in the opinion of the civilized world. So far from seeing, what some believed they saw, a spirit of unworthy compliance in such a course, it appeared to me the only one which suited either the dignity or the duty of my country. While this debt remained unpaid, both before and after 1870, I did not think it my province to open formally a line of argument on a question of prospective rather than immediate moment, which might have prejudiced the matter of duty lying nearest our hand, and morally injured Great Britain not less than Ireland, Churchmen and Non-Conformists not less than adherents of the Papal communion, by slackening the disposition to pay the debt of justice. When Parliament had passed the Church act of 1869 and the Land act of 1870, there remained only, under the great head of Imperial equity, one serious question to be dealt with—that of the higher education. I consider that the Liberal majorty in the House of Commons and the Government to which I had the honor and satisfaction to belong formally tendered payment in full of this portion of the debt by the Irish University bill of February, 1873. Some, indeed, think that it was overpaid—a question into which this is manifestly not the place to enter. But the Roman Catholic prelacy of Ireland thought fit to procure the rejection of that measure, by the direct influence which they exercised over a certain number of Irish members of Parliament, and by the temptation which they thus offered —the bid, in effect, which (to use a homely phrase) they made to attract the support of the Tory Opposition. Their efforts were crowned with a complete success. From that time forward I have felt that the situation was changed, and that important matters would have to be cleared by suitable explanations. The debt to Ireland has been paid: a debt to the country at large had still to be disposed of, and this has come to be the duty of the hour. So long, indeed, as I continued to be Prime Minister I should not have considered a broad political discussion on a general question suitable to proceed from me; while neither I nor (I am certain) my colleagues would have been disposed to run the risk of stirring popular passions in a vulgar and unexplained appeal. But every difficulty arising from the necessary limitations of an official position has now been removed.

VII.—ON THE HOME POLICY OF THE FUTURE.

I could not, however, conclude these observations without anticipating and answering an inquiry they suggest. "Are they, then," it will be asked," a recantation and a regret; and what are they meant to recommend as the policy of the future?" My reply shall be succinct and plain. Of what the Liberal party has complished, by word or deed, in establishing the full civil equality of Roman Catholics, I regret nothing and I recant nothing

It is certainly a political misfortune that, during the last thirty years, a Church so tainted in its views of civil obedience, and so unduly capable of changing its front and language after Emancipation from what it had been before, like an actor who has to perform several characters in one piece, should have acquired an extension of its hold upon the highest classes of this country. The conquests have been chiefly, as might have been expected, among women; but the number of male converts, or captives (as I might prefer to call them), has not been inconsiderable. There is no doubt that every one of these secessions is in the nature of a considerable moral and social severance. The breadth of this gap varies according to varities of individual character. But it is too commonly a wide one. Too commonly the spirit of the neophyte is expressed by the words, which have become notorious: "A Catholic first, an Englishman afterwards." Words which properly convey no more than a truism; for every Christian must seek to place his religion even before his country in his inner heart. But very far from a truism in the sense in which we have been led to construe them. We take them to mean that the "convert" intends, in case of any conflict between the Queen and the Pope, to follow the Pope, and let the Queen shift for herself, which, happily, she can well do.

Usually in this country a movement in the highest class would raise a presumption of a similar movement in the mass. It is not so here. Rumors have gone about that the proportion of members of the Papal Church to the population has increased, especially in England. But these rumors would seem to be confuted by authentic figures. The Roman Catholic marriages, which supply a competent test, and which were 4.89 per cent of the whole in 1854, and 4.62 per cent in 1859, were 4.09 per cent in 1869, and 4.02 per cent in 1871.

There is something at the least abnormal in such a partial growth, taking effect as it does among the wealthy and noble, while the people cannot be charmed, by any incantation, into the Roman camp. The original Gospel was supposed to be meant especially for the poor; but the Gospel of the nineteenth century from Rome courts another and less modest destination. If the Pope does not control more souls among us he certainly controls more acres.

The severance, however, of a certain number of lords of the soil from those who till it can be borne. And so I trust will in like manner be endured the new and very real "aggression" of the principles promulgated by Papal authority, whether they are or are not loyally disclaimed. n this matter each man is his own judge and his own guide: I can speak for myself. I am no longer able to say, as I would have said before 1870, "There is nothing in the necessary belief of the Roman

Catholic which can appear to impeach his full civil title; for, whatsoever be the follies of ecclesiastical power in his Church, his Church itself has not required of him, with binding authority, as consent to any principles inconsistent with his civil duty." That ground is now, for the present at least, cut from under my feet. What then is to be our course of policy hereafter? First, let me say that, as regards the great Imperial settlement, achieved by slow degrees, which has admitted men of all creeds subsisting among us to Parliament, that I conceive to be so determined beyond all doubt or question as to have become one of the deep foundation-stones of the existing Constitution. But, inasmuch as, short of this great charter of public liberty, and independently of all that has been done, there are pending matters of comparatively minor moment which have been, or may be, subjects of discussion, not without interest attaching to them, I can suppose a question to arise in the minds of some. My own views and intentions in the future are of the smallest significance. But if the arguments I have here offered make it my duty to declare them, I say at once, the future will be exactly as the past: in the little that depends on me I shall be guided hereafter, as heretofore, by the rule of maintaining equal civil rights, irrespective of religious differences, and shall resist all attempts to exclude the members of the Roman Church from the benefit of that rule. Indeed, I may say that I have already given conclusive indications of this view by supporting in Parliament, as a Minister, since 1870, the repeal of the Ecclesiastical Titles act, for what I think ample reasons. Not only because the time has not yet come when we can assume the consequences of the revolutionary measures of 1870 to have been thoroughly weighed and digested by all capable men in the Roman communion. Not only because so great a numerical proportion are, as I have before observed, necessarily incapable of mastering and forming their personal judgment upon the case. Quite irrespectively even of these considerations, I hold that our onward even course should not be changed by follies, the consequences of which, if the worst come to the worst, this country will have alike the power and, in case of need, the will to control. The State will, I trust, be ever careful to leave the domain of religious conscience free, and yet to keep it to its own domain; and to allow neither private caprice nor, above all, foreign arrogance to dictate to it in the discharge of its proper office. "England expects every man to do his duty;" and none can be so well prepared under all circumstances to exact its performance as that Liberal party which has done the work of justice alike for Nonconformists and for Papal dissidents, and whose members have so often, for the sake of that work, hazarded their credit with the markedly Protestant constituencies of the country. Strong the State of the United Kingdom has always been in material strength, and its moral panoply is now, we may hope, pretty complete.

It is not, then, for the dignity of the Crown and people of the United Kingdom to be diverted from a path which they have deliberately chosen, and which it does not rest with all the myrmidons of the Apostolic Chamber either openly to obstruct or secretly to undermine. It is rightfully to be expected, it is greatly to be desired, that the Roman Catholics of this country should do in the nineteenth century what their forefathers of England, except a handful of emissaries, did in the sixteenth, when they were marshaled in resistance to the Armada, and in the seventeenth, when, in despite of the Papal Chair, they sat in the House of Lords, under the oath of allegiance. That which we are entitled to desire, we are entitled also to expect. Indeed, to say we did not expect it would, in my judgment, be the true way of conveying an "insult" to those concerned. In this expectation we may be partially disappointed. Should those to whom I appeal thus unhappily come to bear witness in their own persons to the decay of sound, manly, true life in their Church, it will be their loss more than ours. The inhabitants of these islands, as a whole, are stable, though sometimes credulous and excitable; resolute, though sometimes boastful; and a strong-headed and sound-hearted race will not be hindered either by latent or by avowed dissents, due to the foreign influence of a caste, from the accomplishment of its mission in the world.

(*D*) APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

The numbers here given correspond with those of the Eighteen Propositions given in the text, where it would have been less convenient to cite the originals.

1, 2, 3. "Ex qua omnino falsa socialis regiminis idea haud timent erroneam illam fovere opinionem, Catholicæ Ecclesiæ, animarumque saluti maxime exitiatem, a rec. mem. Gregorio XIV. prædecessore Nostro *detramentum* appellatam (eadem Encycl. mirari), nimirum, libertatem conscientiæ et cultuum esse proprium cujuscunque hominis jus, quod lege proclamari, et asseri debet in omni recte constituta societate, et jus civibus inesse ad omnimodam libertatem nulla vel ecclesiastica, vel civili auctoritate coarctandum, quo suos conceptus quoscumque sive voce sive typis, sive alia ratione palam publiceque manifestare ac declarare valeant."—[Encyclical Letter.

4. "Atque silentio præterire non possumus eorum audaciam, qui sanam non sustinentes doctrinam 'illis Apostilicæ Sedis judiciis, et decretis, quorum objectum ad bonum generale Ecclesiæ, ejusdemque jura, lac disciplinam spectare declaratur, dummodo fidei morumque dogmata non attingat, posse assensum et obedientiam detractam absque peccato, et absque ulla Catholicæ professionis jactura,' "—[Ibid.

5. "Ecclesia non est vera perfectaque societas plane libera nec pollet suis propriis et constantibus juribus sibi a divino suo Fundatore collatis, sed civilis potestatis est definire quæ sint Ecclesiæ jura, ac limites, intra quos eadem jura exercere queat."—[Syllabus v.

6. "Romani Pontifices et Concilia œcumenica a limitibus suæ potestatis recesserunt, jura Principum usurparunt, atque etiam in rebus fidei et morum definiendis errarunt."—[Ibid. xxiii.

7. "Ecclesia vis inferendæ potestatem non habet, neque potestatem ullam temporalem directam vel indirectam."—[Ibid. xxiv.

8. Præter potestatem episcopatui inhærentem, alia est attributa temporalis potestas a civili imperio vel expresse vel tacite concessa, revocanda propterea, cum libuerit, a civili imperio."—[Ibid. xxv.

9. "Ecclesiæ et personarum ecclesiasticarum immunitas a jure civili ortum habuit."—[Ibid. xxx.

10. "In conflictu legum utriusque potestatis, jus civile prævalet."—[Ibid. xlii.

11. "Catholicis viris probari potest ea juventutis instituendæ ratio, quæ sit a Catholica fide et ab Ecclesiæ potestate sejuncta, quæque rerum dumtaxat naturalium scientiam ac terrenæ socialis vitæ fines tantummodove saltem primarium spectet."—[Ibid. xlviii.

12. "Philosophicarum rerum morumque scientia, itemque civiles leges possunt et debent a divina et ecclesiastica auctoritate declinare."—[Ibid. lvii.

13. "Matrimonii sacramentum non est nisi contractui accesorium ab eoque separabile, ipsumque sacramentum in una tantum nuptiali benedictione situm est."—[Ibid. lxvi.

"Vi contractus mere civilis potest inter Christianos constare veri nominis matrimonium: falsumque est, aut contractum matrimonii inter Christianos semper esse sacramentum, aut nullum esse contractum, sacramentum excludatur."—[Ibid, lxxii.

14. "De temporalis regni cum spirituali compatibilitate disputant inter se Christianæ et Catholicæ Ecclesiæ filii."—[Syllabus lxxv.

15. "Abrogatio civilis imperii, quo Apostolica Sedes potitur, ad Ecclesiæ libertatem felicitatemque vel maxime conduceret."—[Ibid. lxxvi.

16. "Ætate hac nostra non amplius expedit religionem Catholicam haberi tanquam unicam status religionem, cæteris quibuscumque cultibus exclusis."—[Ibid. lxxvii.

17. "Hinc laudabiliter in quibusdam Catholici nominis regionibus lege cautum est, ut hominibus illuc immigrantibus liceat publicum proprii cujusque cultus exercitium habere."—[Ibid. lxxviii.

18. "Romanus Pontifex potest ac debet cum progressu, cum liberalismo et cum recenti civilitate sese reconciliare et componere."—[Ibid. lxxx.

APPENDIX B.

I have contented myself with a minimum of citation from the documents of the period before Emancipation. Their full effect can only be gathered by such as are acquainted with, or will take the trouble to refer largely to, the originals. It is worth while, however, to cite the following passage from Bishop Doyle, as it may convey, through the indignation it expresses, an idea of the amplitude of the assurances which had been (as I believe, most honestly and sincerely) given:

"There is no justice, my Lord, in thus condemning us. Such conduct on the part of our opponents creates in our bosoms a sense of wrong being done to us; it exhausts our patience, it provokes our indignation, and prevents us from reiterating our efforts to obtain a more impartial hearing. We are tempted, in such cases as these, to attribute unfair motives to those who differ from us, as we cannot conceive how men gifted with intelligence can fail to discover truths so plainly demonstrated as,

"That our faith or our allegiance is not regulated by any such doctrines as those imputed to us;

"That our duties to the Government of our country are not influenced nor affected by any Bulls or practices of Popes;

"That these duties are to be learned by us, as by every other class of His Majesty's subjects, from the Gospel, from the reason given to us by God, from that love of country which nature has implanted in our hearts, and from those constitutional maxims which are as well understood and as highly appreciated by Catholics of the present day as by their ancestors, who founded them with Alfred, or secured them at Runnymede."—[Doyle's "Essay on the Catholic Claims," London, 1826, p. 38.

The same general tone, as in 1826, was maintained in the answers of the witnesses from Maynooth College before the Commission of 1855. See, for example, pp. 132, 161-4, 272-3, 275, 361, 370-5, 381-2, 394-6, 405. The Commission reported (p. 64), "We see no reason to believe that there has been any disloyalty in the teaching of the College, or any disposition to impair the obligations of an unreserved allegiance to your Majesty."

APPENDIX C.

Compare the recent and ominous forecasting of the future European policy of the British Crown, in an article from a Romish periodical for the current month, which has direct relation to these matters, and which has every appearance of proceeding from authority:

"Surely in an European complication, such as may any day arise, nay, such as must ere long arise, from the mutual gravitation of the forces which are for the moment kept in check and truce by the necessity of preparation for their inevitable collision, it may very well be that the future prosperity of England may be staked in the struggle, and that the side which she may take may be determined, not either by justice or interest, but by a passionate resolve to keep up the Italian kingdom at any hazard."—[The Month for November, 1864: "Mr. Gladstone's Durham Letter," p. 265.

This is a remarkable disclosure. With whom could England be brought into conflict by any disposition she might feel to keep up the Italian kingdom? Considered as States, both Austria and France are in complete harmony with Italy. But it is plain that Italy has some enemy; and the writers of *The Month* appear to know who it is.

APPENDIX D.

Notice has been taken, both in this country and abroad, of the apparent inertness of public men, and of at least one British Administration, with respect to the subject of these pages. See Friedberg, "Granzen zwischen Staat und Kirche," Abtheilung iii., pp. 755-6; and the preface to the fifth volume of Mr. Greenwood's elaborate, able, and judicial work, entitled "Cathedra Petri," p. 4.

If there be any chance of such a revival, it would become our political leaders to look more closely into the peculiarities of a system, which denies the right of the subject to freedom of thought and action upon matters most material to his civil and religious welfare. There is no mode of ascertaining the spirit and tendency of great institutions but in a careful study of their history. The writer is profoundly impressed with the conviction that our political instructors have wholly neglected this important duty: or, which is perhaps worse, left in the hands of a class of persons whose zeal has outrun their discretion, and who have sought rather to engage the prejudices than the judgment of their hearers in the cause they have, no doubt sincerely at heart.

TRANSLATIONS.

FROM THE VATICAN DECREES.

(A.) Therefore do we by Our Apostolic authority reprove, denounce, and condemn generally and particularly all the evil opinions and doctrines specially mentioned in this letter, and we wish that they may be held as disapproved, denounced, and condemned by all children of the Catholic Church.

(B.) We teach and define it to be a doctrine divinely revealed: that when the Roman pontiff speaks *ex cathedra*, that is, when, in the exercise of his office as pastor and teacher of all Christians, and in virtue of his supreme Apostolical authority, he defines that a doctrine of faith or morals is to be held by the universal church, he possesses, through the divine assistance promised to him in the blessed Peter, that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed His Church to be endowed in defining a doctrine of faith or morals: and therefore that such definitions of the Roman pontiff are irreformable of themselves and not by force of the consent of the Church thereto.

(C.) The pastors and faithful of whatever rite and dignity are bound by the duty of hierarchical subordination and of true obedience, not only in things which appertain to faith and morals but likewise in those things which concern the discipline and government of the Church spread throughout the world. . . . . This is the doctrine of Catholic truth, from which no one can depart without loss of faith and salvation.

We also teach and declare that he is the supreme judge of the faithful, and that in all causes calling for ecclesiastical trial recourse may be had to his judgment: but the decision of the Apostolic See, above which there is no higher authority, cannot be reconsidered by any one; nor is it lawful for any one to judge his judgment.

(D.) PROPOSITIONS OF THE ENCYCLICAL AND SYLLABUS.

1, 2, 3. From this totally false notion of social government, they fear not to uphold that erroneous opinion, most pernicious to the Catholic Church and to the salvation of souls, which was called by our predecessor of recent memory Gregory XVI. a *delirium* (see the same Encyc.), namely that liberty of conscience and of worship is the right of every man which ought to be proclaimed and asserted by law in every rightly constituted society, and that citizens possess the right to all manner of liberty, unrestrained by either ecclesiastical or civil authority, in publicly putting forth and declaring all their opinions whatsoever, either by speech, or by types, or by any other method.

4. And we cannot pass over in silence the audacity of those who, not sustaining sound doctrine, assert that without sin and without any loss of the Catholic profession, assent and obedience can be withheld from those judgments and decrees of the Apostolic See whose object is declared to be the general good of the Church, and its laws and discipline; so long as they do not touch dogmas of faith and morals.

5. The Church is not a true, perfect, and entirely free society, nor does she enjoy her own peculiar and perpetual rights conferred by her Divine Founder, but it belongs to the civil power to define what are the rights of the Church, and the limits within which those rights may be exercised.

6. The Roman Pontiffs and Œcumenical Councils have exceeded the limits of their power, usurped the rights of princes, and erred even in defining matters of faith and morals.

7. The Church has not the power of using force, nor any temporal power, direct or indirect.

8. Besides the power inherent to the episcopacy there is another temporal power granted it by the civil government, either expressly or tacitly, revocable therefore at the pleasure of the civil government.

9. The immunity of the Church and of ecclesiastical persons originates from the civil law.

10. In a conflict between the laws of the two powers, the civil law prevails.

11. Catholics may approve that system of instructing youth which is separated from Catholic faith and the power of the Church, and which teaches exclusively or at least principally the knowledge of natural things and the ends of worldly social life.

12. The knowledge of philosophical things and morals and also civil laws can and ought to be independent of divine and ecclesiastical authority.

13. The sacrament of matrimony is only an accessory of the contract and can be separated from it, and the sacrament itself consists in the nuptial benediction only.

Marriage truly so called can be constituted between Christians by virtue of a mere civil contract; and it is false either that the matrimonial contract between Christians is always a sacrament, or that there is no contract if the sacrament be excluded.

14. The children of the Christian and Catholic Church disagree as to the compatibility of the temporal with the spiritual power.

15. The abrogation of the civil power which the Apostolic See possesses would greatly conduce to the liberty and happiness of the Church.

16. In this our age it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion should be recognized as the only religion of the State, all other religions being excluded.

17. Hence it has been wisely provided by law in certain countries called Catholic that immigrants coming there should be allowed the public exercise of their own form of worship.

18. The Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile and accommodate himself to progress, liberalism, and modern civilization.

A SKETCH OF MR. GLADSTONE.

MR. GLADSTONE THE SPORT OF HIS OWN INTELLECT—THE MOST UNCERTAIN OF STATESMEN—HE WAS NOT FORMED TO BE A LEADER, BUT WOULD BE INVALUABLE AS AN AUXILIARY.

The following portrait of Mr. Gladstone, by Prof. Bonamy Price, is from an article in *Fraser's Magazine* for February, 1864, entitled "The Political Temper of the Nation:"

Few men have derived from nature so peculiar a mental constitution as Mr. Gladstone. Its singularity—and it is most marked—consists in this: That he combines the extreme of impressionableness with the extreme of want of intuition. Never, probably, was there a statesman so perfectly accessible to the influence of every intellectual element of every question, so ready to surrender himself to it, and yet so destitute of the light within, of the judging faculty, to enable him to assign to each its proper weight and power. There have been many skeptics of strong intellectual force who were able to penetrate to the depths of every problem and analyze their every element, and yet never worked their way out to a comprehensive and final conclusion. But these men have been cold and indifferent. Intellectually, Mr. Gladstone belongs to this class, but morally he is separated from them by a distance as wide as that which sunders apart the two poles. Each partial truth that reveals itself to his understanding enkindles a passion which for a while refuses to be controlled; and Mr. Gladstone is thus led across the most opposite regions of thought and principle by this peculiar enthusiasm of his nature. This tendency of his mind has been much aggravated by education. Mr. Gladstone has been called an over-educated man; and in reference to his peculiar constitution of character, the assertion is true. Abstractedly a man cannot be over-educated; he cannot have too much knowledge or too varied an insight into human existence. Sir George Lewis was intellectually a still abler, a still more educated man than Mr. Gladstone, but no one ever said that his education impaired his judgment, or rendered his counsels more uncertain, less surely to be trusted. Mr. Gladstone's education—and it is of the most accomplished—renders him more capable of diving into the depths of every problem; but it has not bestowed on him the faculty of judging the relative values of his discoveries. It has refined and strengthened the power of his intellect to detect the nicest shades of distinction, to track out the most subtle elements, to appreciate the most delicate influences; but it has not inspired him with "the vision and the faculty divine," the instinctive sense of the great and true, the discernment of the master principle, the faith in the commanding truth, which governs by its own right, and thrusts aside objections as subordinate, even if no answer suggests itself for the moment. Hence Mr. Gladstone is the sport of his own intellect; it leads him about at its pleasure, a passionate and sincere slave, but still a slave. No man has contradicted himself so often in the House of Commons as Mr. Gladstone; no man has ever contended with so much vehement earnestness for the most conflicting views on the same question. By no one can Mr. Gladstone be so powerfully and so eloquently refuted as by himself. For a while he was denounced for insincerity; but the world has grown more just, and the charge has died away. Mr. Gladstone is the most self-contradicting, the most inconsistent, the most uncertain of statesmen, not because he is insincere or fickle morally, but because he cannot command his own intellect. The principles and conclusions which he advocates for the day spring not from an intuition which is always the same, and is a sure guarantee to himself and others for consistency; they are the products of computation—of detailed reasonings—of a process of mind which may almost be called arithmetical. When a great subject is presented to Mr. Gladstone, he addresses the whole attention of his powerful mind to its investigation; he probes into its very heart; he brings to light every element; he marshals the arguments on the contending sides; he adds the totals, strikes the balance, and then decides on his opinion. But there is a fatal weakness in this method, and Mr. Gladstone is profoundly but perhaps not consciously aware of the little confidence which is to be placed in its results. His conclusions are no dictates of an intuitive reason, they are substraction sums of which the figures depend on accident. At one period four reasons were found for an income tax and five against it; its extinction was passionately advanced. At a later period two more reasons had been discovered in its favor. The balance now lay the other way, and its retention was as warmly defended. It is the necessary characteristic of a mind so constituted never to rest in any conclusion; it is never satisfied, for it does not feel itself supported by genuine insight; it is ever hankering after more research, more reasonings, more elements in the case, more matter for reconsideration. The keenness of the intellectual faculty gives zest to the process; the discovery of a new feature exercises an uncontrolable fascination over the judgment. A man of such a nature finds no boundary line, within himself, beyond which his convictions and his principles will never wander; he can give no pledge to his followers that the doctrines which he inculcates upon their acceptance so irresistibly may not be superseded by their direct opposites so soon as a new session has come round.

Such a man was not formed to be a leader. Leaders must never doubt; above all, their aims must be defined, their main principles fixed beyond all suspicion of uncertainty. No politician can or does feel sure of Mr. Gladstone, for he never feels sure of himself. As an auxiliary he is incomparable. For versatility of talent, for range of educational accomplishments, for breadth of treatment, and also for that exquisite power of generalizing which instructs as well as delights the hearers, Mr. Gladstone has no rival. But the necessities of his nature demand that he shall be subjected to, or rather be guided by, a will and a character stronger than his own—and where can such a man be found on the Liberal side? One there was, pre-eminent for simplicity, strength of intellect, depth and range of knowledge and firm judgement; but alas, united England now bewails his untimely loss. It would have been his fortune, one cannot doubt, to seize the reins when dropped from the veteran Premier's hands; he, too, would have led the two centers of the House of Commons; and had Providence willed that he should have completed the full span of human life, it would have been hard to have prescribed a limit to the duration of his power. But he is gone; and the two contending rivals, the two impossibilities, as we almost might venture to call them, stand face to face without any visible solution for the future of the House of Commons.

ANSWERS TO GLADSTONE.

REPLY OF ARCHBISHOP MANNING.

THE CONDITIONS OF CIVIL ALLEGIANCE NOT CHANGED BY THE VATICAN DECREES—THE CATHOLIC'S ALLEGIANCE AS TRUE AND AS LOYAL AS THAT OF ANY SUBJECT OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

The London Daily News publishes the following letter to the editor from Archbishop Manning:

SIR: The gravity of the subject on which I address you, affecting, as it must, every Catholic in the British Empire, will, I hope, obtain from your courtesy the publication of this letter.

This morning I received a copy of a pamphlet entitled "The Vatican Decrees in their bearing on Civil Allegiance." I find in it a direct appeal to myself, both for the office I hold, and for the writings I have published. I gladly acknowledge the duty that lies upon me for both those reasons. I am bound by the office I bear not to suffer a day to pass without repelling from the Catholics of this country the lightest imputation upon their loyalty; and, for my teaching, I am ready to show that the principles I have ever taught are beyond impeachment upon that score.

It is true, indeed, that in page 57 of the pamphlet Mr. Gladstone expresses his belief "that many of his Roman Catholic friends and fellow-countrymen" are, "to say the least of it, as good citizens as himself." But, as the whole pamphlet is an elaborate argument to prove that the teaching of the Vatican Council renders it impossible for them to be so, I cannot accept this graceful acknowledgment, which implies that they are good citizens because they are at variance with the Catholic Church.

I should be wanting in duty to the Catholics of this country and to myself, if I did not give a prompt contradiction to this statement, and if I did not with equal promptness affirm that the loyalty of our civil allegiance is not in spite of the teaching of the Catholic Church, but because of it.

The sum of the argument in the pamphlet just pub-

lished to the world is this: That, by the Vatican decrees, such a change has been made in the relations of Catholics to the civil power of States, that it is no longer possible for them to render the same undivided civil allegiance as it was possible for Catholics to render before the promulgation of those decrees.

In answer to this, it is for the present sufficient to affirm:

1. That the Vatican decrees have in no jot or tittle changed either the obligations or the conditions of civil allegiance.

2. That the civil allegiance of Catholics is as undivided as that of all Christians, and of all men who recognize a divine or natural moral law.

3. That the civil allegiance of no man is unlimited; and therefore the civil allegiance of all men who believe in God, or are governed by conscience, is in that sense divided.

In this sense, and in no other, can it be said with truth that the civil allegiance of Catholics is divided. The civil allegiance of every Christian man in England is limited by conscience and the law of God; and the civil allegiance of Catholics is limited neither less nor more.

The public peace of the British Empire has been consolidated in the last half century by the elimination of religious conflicts and inequalities from our laws. The Empire of Germany might have been equally peaceful and stable if its statesmen had not been tempted in an evil hour to rake up the old fires of religious disunion. The hand of one man, more than any other, threw this torch of discord into the German Empire. The history of Germany will record the name of Dr. Ignatius von Döllinger as the author of this national evil. I lament not only to read the name, but to trace the arguments, of Dr. von Dollinger in the pamphlet before me. May God preserve these kingdoms from the public and private calamities which are visibly impending over Germany! The author of the pamphlet, in his first line, assures us that his "purpose is not polemical, but pacific." I am sorry that so good an intention should have so widely erred in the selection of the means.

But my purpose is neither to criticise nor to controvert. My desire and my duty as an Englishman, as a Catholic, and as a pastor, is to claim for my flock and for myself, a civil allegiance as pure, as true, and as loyal as is rendered by the distinguished author of the pamphlet, or by any subject of the British Empire.

I remain, Sir, your faithful servant,

+ HENRY EDWARD, Archbishop of Westminster.

Nov. 7.

REPLY OF LORD ACTON.

THE VATICAN DOCTRINES NOT OF RECENT GROWTH.

THE DOCTRINES WHICH MR. GLADSTONE IS COMBATTING OLDER THAN THE VATICAN COUNCIL—HIS INDICTMENT NOT COMPLETE ENOUGH TO BE JUST.

The London Times publishes the following preliminary reply to Mr. Gladstone's public expostulation, by Lord Acton:

ATHENÆUM, Nov. 8.

DEAR MR. GLADSTONE: I will not anticipate by a single word the course which those who are immediately concerned may adopt in answer to your challenge. But there are points which I think you have overlooked, and which may be raised most fitly by those who are least responsible. The question of policy and opportuneness I leave for others to discuss with you. Speaking in the open daylight, from my own point of view, as a Roman Catholic, born in the nineteenth century, I cannot object that facts which are of a nature to influence the belief of men should be brought completely to their knowledge. Concealment is unworthy of those things which are divine and holy in religion, and in those things which are human and profane publicity has value as a check.

I understand your argument to be substantially as follows: The Catholics obtained emancipation by declaring that they were in every sense of the term loyal and faithful subjects of the realm, and that Papal Infallibility was not a dogma of their Church. Later events having falsified one declaration, have disturbed the stability of the other; and the problem therefore arises whether the authority which has annulled the profession of faith made by the Catholics would not be competent to change their conceptions of political duty.

This is a question that may be fairly asked, and it was long since made familiar to the Catholics by the language of their own Bishops. One of them has put it in the following terms: "How shall we persuade the Protestants that we are not acting in defiance of honor and good faith if, having declared that infallibility was not an article of our faith while we were contending for our rights, we should, now that we have got what we wanted, withdraw from our public declaration and affirm the contrary?" The case is, *primâ facie*, a strong one, and it would be still more serious if the whole structure of our liberties and our toleration was founded on the declarations given by the English and Irish Bishops some years before the Relief Act. Those documents, interesting and significant as they are, are unknown to the Constitution. What is known, and what was for a generation part of the law of the country, is something more solemn and substantial than a series of unproved assertions—namely, the oath in which the political essence of those declarations was concentrated. That was the security which Parliament required; that was the pledge by which we were bound; and it binds us no more. The Legislature judging that what was sufficient for Republicans was sufficient for Catholics, abolished the oath, for the best reasons, some time before the disestablishment of the Irish Church. If there is no longer a special bond for the loyalty of Catholics, the fact is due to the deliberate judgment of the House of Commons. After having surrendered the only real Constitutional security there seems scarcely reason to lament the depreciation of a less substantial guarantee, which was very indirectly connected with the action of Parliament, and was virtually superseded by the oath.

The doctrines against which you are contending did not begin with the Vatican Council. At the time when the Catholic oath was repealed, the Pope had the same right and power to excommunicate those who denied his authority to depose princes that he possesses now. The writers most esteemed at Rome held that doctrine as an article of faith; a modern Pontiff had affirmed that it cannot be abandoned without taint of heresy, and that those who questioned and restricted his authority in temporal matters were worse than those who rejected it in spirituals, and accordingly men suffered death for this cause as others did for blasphemy and atheism. The

recent decrees have neither increased the penalty nor made it more easy to inflict.

That is the true answer to your appeal. Your indictment would be more just if it was more complete. If you pursue the inquiry further you will find graver matter than all you have enumerated, established by higher and more ancient authority than a meeting of bishops half-a-century ago. And then I think you will admit that your Catholic countrymen cannot fairly be called on to account for every particle of a system which has never come before them in its integrity, or for opinions whose existence among divines they would be exceedingly reluctant to believe.

I will explain my meaning by an examlpe: A Pope who lived in Catholic times, and who is famous in history as the author of the first Crusade, decided that it is no murder to kill excommunicated persons. This rule was incorporated in the Canon law. In the revision of the Code, which took place in the sixteenth century, and produced a whole volume of corrections, the passage was allowed to stand. It appears in every reprint of the "Corpus Juris." It has been for 700 years and continues to be part of the Ecclesiastical law. Far from having been a dead letter, it obtained a new application in the days of the Inquisition, and one of the later Popes has declared that the murder of a Protestant is so good a deed that it atones, and more than atones, for the murder of a Catholic. Again, the greatest legislator of the Mediæval Church laid down this proposition, that allegiance must not be kept with heretical Princes—*cum et qui Deo fidem non servat fides servanda non sit.* This principle was adopted by a celebrated Council, and is confirmed by St. Thomas Aquinas, the oracle of the schools. The Syllabus which you cite has assuredly not acquired greater authority in the Church than the Canon Law and the Lateran Decrees, than Innocent the Third and St. Thomas. Yet these things were as well known when the oath was repealed as they are now. But it was felt that, whatever might be the letter of Canons and the spirit of the Ecclesiastical laws, the Catholic people of this country might be honorably trusted.

But I will pass from the letter to the spirit which is moving men at the present day. It belongs peculiarly to the character of a genuine Ultramontane not only to guide his life by the example of canonized saints, but to receive with reverence and submission the words of Popes. Now Pius V., the only Pope who has been proclaimed a saint for many centuries, having deprived Elizabeth, commissioned an assassin to take her life; and his next successor, on learning that the Protestants were being massacred in France, pronounced the action glorious and holy, but comparatively barren of results; and implored the king during two months, by his Nuncio and his Legate, to carry the work on to the bitter end until every Huguenot had recanted or perished. It is hard to believe that these things can excite in the bosom of the most fervent Ultramontane that sort of admiration or assent that displays itself in action. If they do not, then it cannot be truly said that Catholics forfeit their moral freedom or place their duty at the mercy of another.

There is waste of power by friction even in well-constructed machines, and no machinery can enforce that degree of unity and harmony which you apprehend. Little fellowship or confidence is possible between a man who recognizes the common principles of morality at we find them in the overwhelming mass of the writers of our Church and one who, on learning that the murder of a Protestant Sovereign has been inculcated by a saint, or the slaughter of Protestant subjects approved by a Pope, sets himself to find a new interpretation for the Decalogue. There is little to apprehend from combinations between men divided by such a gulf as this, or from the unity of a body composed of such antagonistic materials. But where there is not union of an active or aggressive kind, there may be unity in defense; and it is possible, in making provision against the one, to promote and to confirm the other.

There has been, and I believe there is still, some exaggeration in the idea men form of the agreement in thought and deed which authority can accomplish. As far as decrees, censures, and persecution could commit the Court of Rome, it was committed to the denial of the Copernican system. Nevertheless, the history of astronomy shows a whole catena of distinguished Jesuits; and, a century ago, a Spaniard who thought himself bound to adopt the Ptolemaic theory was laughed at by the Roman divines. The submission of Fénelon, which Protestants and Catholics have so often celebrated, is another instance to my point. When his book was condemned, Fénelon publicly accepted the judgment as the voice of God. He declared that he adhered to the decree absolutely and without a shadow of reserve, and there were no bounds to his submission. In private he wrote that his opinions were perfectly orthodox and remained unchanged, that his opponents were in the wrong, and that Rome was getting religion into peril.

It is not the unpropitious times only, but very nature of things, that protect Catholicism from the consequences of some theories that have grown up within it. The Irish did not shrink from resisting the arms of Henry II., though two Popes had given him dominion over them. They fought against William III., although the Pope had given him efficient support in his expedition. Even James II., when he could not get a miter for Petre, reminded Innocent that people could be very good Catholics and yet do without Rome. Philip II. was excommunicated and deprived, but he dispatched his army against Rome with the full concurrence of the Spanish divines.

That opinions likely to injure our position as loyal subjects of a Protestant sovereign, as citizens of a free State, as members of a community divided in religion, have flourished at various times, and in various degrees; that they can claim high sanction; that they are often uttered in the exasperation of controversy, and are most strongly urged at a time when there is no possibility of putting them into practice—this all men must concede. But I affirm that, in the fiercest conflict of the Reformation, when the rulers of the Church had almost lost heart in the struggle for existence, and exhausted every resource of their authority, both political and spiritual, the bulk of the English Catholics retained the spirit of a better time. You do not, I am glad to say, deny that this continues to be true. But you think that we ought to be compelled to demonstrate one of two things—that the Pope cannot, by virtue of powers asserted by the late Council, make a claim which he was perfectly able to make by virtue of powers asserted for him before; or, that he would be resisted if he did. The first is superfluous. The second is not capable of receiving a written demonstration. Therefore, neither of the alternatives you propose to the Catholics of this country opens to us a way of escaping from the reproach we have incurred. Whether there is more truth in your misgivings or in my confidence the event will show, I hope, at no distant time.

I remain sincerely yours, ACTON.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING ON THE CATHOLIC POLICY OF THE FUTURE.

THE SPIRITUAL POWER OF THE POPE INCREASING WITH THE DECLINE IN HIS TEMPORAL AUTHORITY—THE POPE AS AN ARBITRATOR—ONE OF THE GREATEST CONTROVERSIES THE WORLD HAS EVER SEEN ABOUT TO OPEN.

From The London Times, Nov. 9.

A large meeting of Roman Catholics assembled at Archbishop Manning's house at Westminster on Thursday night, to hear his inaugural address to the Roman Catholic Academia in reference to the future policy of the Catholic world. In the course of his observations he said they were all aware that the Catholic Academia was formed at the close of the last century to unite Catholics throughout the world in opposing the Atheistical teaching of the so-called Free-thinkers of France and Germany, whose thoughts were disseminated by the free press of England. Thirteen years ago it was found necessary to extend the work of the Association to England, and he was glad to say, though he did not like to use exulting words, that they had done much to correct and educate the press of this country. In the present crisis, and looking to the coming great future struggle, they had a vast work before them. Looking at the hostility manifested on the Continent to the Sovereign Pontiff, he invited their special attention to the best means of asserting his infallibility and his right to spiritual and temporal power. One thing he would call their attention to—namely, that since his temporal power on the Continent had been denied him, his spiritual power and influence over his subjects had greatly increased. In the conflict of nations which they had seen around them since their departure from their allegiance to the temporal power of the Holy Father, a vast amount of blood had been shed, and nations in their perplexity had lately been seeking some means to avert the terrible calamities of war. At the International Arbitration Conference recently held at Geneva, one of the influential speakers had proposed that cases of national dispute should be submitted to arbitrators appointed from the principal nations of the world, and their decision the conflicting nations should be called upon to obey. If, however, the nations in question refused to submit, then the whole of the other nations were to be called upon to join in a war against the contending party. Instead of this proposed system putting an end to war, could they, he would ask, imagine anything more likely to prolong European wars than such a plan? There could be but one authorized arbitrator between the nations of the earth, and that one, he need scarcely tell them, was the one who was not interested in the temporal affairs of one nation more than another, but was impartial to all, and that one was the Sovereign Pontiff himself. Then there was another meeting to which he would call their attention, and that was one which had been held at Bonn for the purpose of endeavoring to unite persons of various religious beliefs upon spiritual matters, according to the teachings of what they called the Old Catholics, to be settled by the history of the Catholic Church. Well, the question which would naturally arise in the mind of a true Catholic would be as to who would have to select the historians to be appealed to. The answer of the Catholic Church would be that just as a man only knows his own spirit and his own history, so it is with the Church. The Catholic Church knows her own history, and none other knows it so well. To her historians and to her teachings alone, then, such parties must return. The next question, then, to which he would invite their attention was the modern scepticism, free thought, and so-called scientific teachings of the day in relation to Catholic teaching, and for an illustration of this style of thought he would refer them to Prof. Tyndall's address the other day at the Belfast meeting of the British Association. Upon this subject they would do well to read a very excellent article in *The Times* of Saturday last. Whoever wrote that article, he was a good man, and knew what he was writing about. It was the old story of Galileo, and they would do well to study these articles for the purpose of answering them according to the teachings of the Catholic Church. Other subjects to which he would like them to give their attention were the various phases of thought in the Protestant Church, and especially those among the Dissenters. The other questions which he invited their most serious consideration to were the infallibility of the Holy Father, his right to temporal as well as spiritual authority, and, amid all the conflicting opinions of the world, the ultimate necessity of acknowledging civil allegiance to him as their only safety. Within the last 24 hours it had been intimated to him that the Catholic world was threatened with a controversy on the whole of the decrees of the Vatican Council. From this and other matters which had come to his knowledge he could see that they were on the very eve of one of the mightiest controversies the religious world had ever seen. Certainly nothing like the controversy on which they were about to enter had occurred during the last 300 years, and they must be prepared. If they would only prepare themselves he did not fear for the decrees of Vatican Council or for the Vatican itself, But they must have no half-hearted measures. They must have no half-fearful, half hearted assertions of the Sovereign Pontiff's claim; they must not fear to declare to England, and to the world through the free press of England, the Sovereign Pontiff's claim to infallibility, his right to temporal power, and the duty of the nations of the earth to return to their allegiance to him. If they did this—if they proclaimed this with no uncertain sound, Protestants in England and Protestants throughout the world would would hear them and be convinced. If they did this, the Protestant world would give them credit for their courage, and believe in them for their own honesty's sake. If, on the other hand, they minced matters and spoke in half-fearful measures, Protestants would only turn away from them for their want of honesty. Protestants knew well what they meant, and what the claims of the Catholic Church are, and therefore it would be best for the Church now to speak out, and he had no fear for the result.

COMMENTS IN ENGLAND.

MEETING OF ROMAN CATHOLICS IN LONDON.

THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN MR. GLADSTONE AND ARCHBISHOP MANNING DISCUSSED—RESOLUTION ADOPTED.

LONDON, Wednesday, Nov. 18, 1874.

A meeting of Roman Catholics was held at Willis's Rooms Nov. 18, to consider the questions raised in the controversy between Mr. Gladstone and Archbishop Manning. Speeches were made denouncing the imputations and assumption in the

recent pamphlet on the Vatican decrees, and a resolution was unanimously adopted declaring that the civil loyalty of Roman Catholics is in no wise affected by the decree of Papal Infallibility.

MR. GLADSTONE ON THE VATICAN DECREES.

CIRCUMSTANCES THAT CALLED FORTH THE PAMPHLET—THE CLAIM OF THE ROMAN COURT TO ABSOLUTE OBEDIENCE—THE STRIFE LIKELY TO ARISE—MR. GLADSTONE'S DECLARATION OF HIS OWN POSITION.

[FROM THE REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.]

LONDON, Nov. 7.—Since the appearance of Mr. Gladstone's paper on Ritualism in *The Contemporary Review* for October last, it has no longer been possible for any honest man to repeat the stupid calumny that the late Prime Minister of Protestant England was a secret convert to the Roman Church. Certain passages in that article roused the fury of Roman Catholic writers to an unusual pitch. The attacks made by them on Mr. Gladstone have led him to reply in a pamphlet which will be out on Monday, and thenceforward Mr. Gladstone will have assumed the position of one of the most conspicuous antagonists of the Court of Rome. Not, I should say at once, the position of an enemy to Roman Catholics, or an assailant of their religion as such, but of the resolute opponent of "that wild ambition which at Rome—not from the throne, but from behind the throne—prompts the movements of the Vatican." Of the Pope himself he speaks always with respect and kindness, and of the great body of Roman Catholics with brotherly love and charity.

The forthcoming pamphlet, to be published by Mr. Murray, bears the title, "The Vatican Decrees, in their bearing on Civil Allegiance: A Political Expostulation." Mr. Gladstone oddly denominates it a Tract, and devotes the first twelve pages of it to an explanation of its Occasion and Scope. In *The Contemporary Review* he was discussing—at the moment—the question whether a handful of the English clergy are or are not engaged in an utterly hopeless and visionary effort to Romanize the Church and people of England; and this was his answer:

> At no time since the bloody reign of Mary has such a scheme been possible. But if it had been possible in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries, it would still have become impossible in the nineteenth; when Rome has substituted for the proud boast of *semper eadem* a policy of violence and change in faith; when she has refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused; when no one can become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another; and when she has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history.

WHY MR. GLADSTONE WROTE HIS PAMPHLET.

This was what provoked the attacks to which he thinks it proper to make some answer. But he insists that both the assertions and his present answer are defensive, not aggressive; that neither the abettors of the Papal chair nor writers from a Papal point of view have a right to remonstrate with the world at large; but it is the world at large that has the fullest right to remonstrate "first with His Holiness, secondly with those who share his proceedings, thirdly even with such as passively allow and accept them." And the pamphlet is, in substance, what he calls it, a political expostulation, addressed mainly to English Roman Catholics, calling upon them to show how, after the recent declarations by the supreme authority of their church, they can reconcile their allegiance to that church with the purity and integrity of their civil allegiance; and setting forth, with singular clearness and power, the claims put forth by Rome to override the obligations of civil allegiance. In doing this, Mr. Gladstone eschews not only religious bigotry, but theological controversy. With theology as such he declares he has nothing to do. It is only in Roman theology thrusting itself into the temporal domain that he recognizes a topic of political discussion. This fact—the fact that the Pope of Rome is a trespasser on ground which belongs to the civil authority, and that he affects to determine by spiritual prerogative questions of the civil sphere—is the whole and sole cause of the mischief. No other Christian body makes any such pretension. All others "contentedly and thankfully accept the benefits of civil order; never pretend that the State is not its own master; make no religious claim to temporal possessions or advantages, and, consequently, never are in perilous collision with the State." Of the mass of Roman Catholics, individually, he would say the same thing. But not so with the leaders. It has ever been made matter of boast that the Roman Church is the only Church or community professing to be a Church which "does not submit or obey or hold its peace when the civil governors of the world command," and the boast is by no less a person than Archbishop Manning. And the pretensions of the Church are not diminishing, but increasing. In the middle ages Rome claimed universal monarchy. The Rome of to-day has abandoned nothing, retracted nothing.

> By condemning (as will be seen) those who, like Bishop Doyle in 1826, charge the medieval Popes with aggression, she unconditionally, even if covertly, maintains what the medieval Popes maintained. But even this is not the worst. The worst by far is that whereas, in the national churches and communities of the Middle Ages, there was a brisk, vigorous, and constant opposition to these outrageous claims, an opposition which stoutly asserted its own orthodoxy, which always caused itself to be respected, and which even sometimes gained the upper hand; now, in this nineteenth century of ours, and while it is growing old, this same opposition has been put out of court, and judicially extinguished within the Papal Church, by the recent decrees of the Vatican.

FOUR PROPOSITIONS DEFENDED.

It is impossible therefore, urges Mr. Gladstone, for persons accepting those decrees to complain when such documents are strictly examined as to their compatibility with civil right and the obedience of

subjects. In defending his language respecting them he alters nothing, but divides the incriminated passage into four separate numbered propositions, viz.:

1. That "Rome has substituted for the proud boast of *semper eadem*, a policy of violence and change in faith."
2. That she has refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused.
3. That no one can now become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another.
4. That she ("Rome") has equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history.

The first and fourth of these he considers together, and disposes of "rather summarily," because "they appear to belong to the theological domain." They refer to a fact and they record an opinion. The fact is that in days within Mr. Gladstone's memory, "the constant, favorite, and imposing argument of Roman controversialists was the unbroken and absolute identity in belief of the Roman Church from the days of our Savior until now;" while now, and ever increasingly during 40 years, this is replaced by the assertions of "a living authority ever ready to open, adopt, and shape Christian doctrine, according to the times." Instead of the constant appeal to history, we have the unmeasured power of the theory of development. The opinion is that the recent Papal decrees are at war with modern thought, which is a question of Divinity, but undoubtedly the opinion of the great majority of the British public; and that of 1870 incurred the censure of "the first living theologian now within the Roman Communion," Dr. Newman, in the well-known passage in which he denounced the "aggressive and insolent faction" who urged on that policy.

Passing to the second proposition, "that Rome has refurbished, and paraded anew, every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused." Is this a fact? asks Mr. Gladstone. Assuming that it is denied, he proceeds to enumerate the propositions, all the holders of which have been condemned by the See of Rome during his own generation, and especially within the last 12 or 15 years.

These condemned propositions (the holders of them also condemned) are from the Encyclicals of Gregory XVI., in 1831, and of Pius the IXth in 1864, and from the "Syllabus" of 1861. The original text of each is given in the appendix, with references. With regard to the meaning and effect of the propositions, Mr. Gladstone remarks:

> It may appear upon a hasty perusal, that neither the infliction of penalty in life, limb, liberty, or goods, on disobedient members of the Christian Church, nor the title to depose Sovereigns and release subjects from their allegiance, with all its revolting consequences, has been here reaffirmed. In terms, there is no mention of them; but in the substance of the propositions, I grieve to say, they are beyond doubt included. For it is notorious that they have been declared and decreed by "Rome," that is to say by Popes and Papal Councils; and the stringent condemnations of the Syllabus include all those who hold that Popes and Papal Councils (declared œcumenical) have transgressed the just limits of their power, or usurped the rights of Princes. What have been their opinions and decrees about persecution I need hardly say; and, indeed, the right to employ physical force is even here undisguisedly claimed (No. 7).

CATHOLICS IN ENGLAND AT THE TIME OF THE EMANCIPATION.

Plainly, however, it is the third proposition which has the greatest practical importance of all, and the greater part of the pamphlet is occupied in maintaining "that no one can now become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another." Mr. Gladstone reminds us that those who, not being converts, but lifelong Catholics, refused assent to the dogma of 1870, underwent the extreme penalty of excommunication. Among them was "the most famous and learned living theologian of the Roman Communion, Dr. von Döllinger, long the foremost champion of his Church." He endured his sentence with temper undisturbed and freedom unimpaired, and with him went many in Germany—the country "from which Luther blew the mighty trumpet, that even now echoes through the land," and which "still retains her primacy in the domain of conscience." Elsewhere, the fermentation has in but few instances come to the surface. The mass of men cannot examine such matters for themselves, and even for the leaders "a change of religious profession is under all circumstances a great and awful thing. Much more is the question, however, between conflicting or apparently conflicting duties arduous, when the religion of a man has been changed for him, over his head, and without the very least of his participation." Hence Mr. Gladstone does not hold the members of the Roman Church in general responsible for recent innovations, though they submit to them, but he calls upon English Roman Catholics to replace themselves where they stood at the date of Catholic Emancipation in 1829. When the question was debated of admitting Catholics to Parliament, their opponents rested mainly on the allegation that no Roman Catholic could give an entire allegiance to the crown, the Papal power claiming a supreme authority in civil matters. But the highest Roman Catholic authorities in this country were appealed to for information. They were asked, Did the Pope claim temporal jurisdiction, or pretend to the power of deposing kings? and answers in abundance were obtained, tending to show that these doctrines were obsolete beyond revival. But something more was wanted. The State was strong enough to be at ease about individual loyalty, but it had a right to know to what demands from the Pope English Catholics were liable. For,

> The theory which placed every human being, in things spiritual and things temporal, at the feet of the Roman Pontiff, had not been an *idolum specûs*, a mere theory of the chamber. Brain-power never surpassed in the political history of the world had been devoted for centuries to the single purpose of working it into the practice of Christendom; had in the West achieved for an impossible problem a partial success; and had in the East punished the obstinate independence of the Church by that Latin conquest of Constantinople, which effectu-

ally prepared the way for the downfall of the Eastern Empire and the establishment of the Turks in Europe.

It was essential then to have an answer to such questions as these:

Did the Pope claim infallibility? Or did he, either without infallibility or with it (and if with it so much the worse), claim an universal obedience from his flock? And were these claims, either or both, affirmed in his Church by authority which even the least Papal of the members of that Church must admit to be binding upon conscience?

The first two, luckily, were covered by the last, for practical purposes, for to the first two no satisfactory answer could be given. The Popes had claimed dogmatic infallibility for nigh a thousand years, and claimed obedience from the baptized members of the Church, but neither claim had been universally admitted by the Church. The Gallican Church had denied it, Councils had failed to affirm it, and down to the close of the last century the prevailing opinions of Cisalpine Churches had been against both claims. The leaders of Roman Catholic opinion in Great Britain spoke out bravely in the same sense. Bishop Doyle, able and eminent, who more than any other Prelate then represented his Church, said in 1825:

"The Catholic professes to obey the Pope in matters which regard his religious faith, and in those matters of ecclesiastical discipline which have already been defined by the competent authorities." And again, being asked, "Does that justify the objection that is made to Catholics that their allegiance is divided?" he answered: "I do not think it does in any way. We are bound to obey the Pope in those things that I have already mentioned. But our obedience to the law, and the allegiance which we owe the sovereign, are complete, and full, and perfect, and undivided, inasmuch as they extend to all political, legal, and civil rights of the king or of his subjects. I think the allegiance due to the king and the allegiance due to the Pope are as distinct and as divided in their nature as any two things can possibly be."

It was on the strength of such declarations, supported by equally explicit testimony (which Mr. Gladstone quotes) from the Vicars Apostolic, and from the Hierachy of the Roman Communion, that Catholic Emancipation was at that time obtained But—

Since that time, all these propositions have been reversed. The Pope's infallibility, when he speaks *ex cathedra* on faith and morals, has been declared, with the assent of the Bishops of the Roman Church, to be an article of faith, binding on the conscience of every Christian; his claim to the obedience of his spiritual subjects has been declared in like manner without any practical limit or reserve; and his supremacy, without any reserve of civil rights, has been similarly affirmed to include everything which relates to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world. And these doctrines, we now know on the highest authority, it is of necessity for salvation to believe.

THE DECREES TO WHICH CATHOLICS ARE NOW ASKED TO SUBMIT.

So complete is the degradation of the Episcopal order in the Latin Church that the claims to which Catholics now submit are not even strictly decrees of a Council, but decrees promulgated *in* a Council, Pius IX. legislating and decreeing. What he decrees is, first, his own infallibility. It is said this is claimed only when he speaks *ex cathedra*, but that is a phrase of which there is no established definition. But "there is still one person, and one only, who can unquestionably declare *ex cathedra* what is *ex cathedra* and what is not, and who can declare it when and as he pleases. That person is the Pope himself. The provision is, that no document he issues shall be valid without a seal; but the seal remains under his own sole lock and key."

It is urged again that the Papal claim does not go beyond matter of faith and morals; but what do not morals include, or where is the line to be drawn which shall exclude any important part of human action from that domain? Rome draws none.

Such a distinction would be the unworthy device of a shallow policy, vainly used to hide the daring of that wild ambition which at Rome—not from the throne, but from behind the throne—prompts the movements of the Vatican. I care not to ask if there be dregs or tatters of human life, such as can escape from the description and boundary of morals. I submit that duty is a power which rises with us in the morning, and goes to rest with us at night. It is co-extensive with the action of our intelligence. It is the shadow which cleaves to us go where we will, and which only leaves us when we leave the light of life. So then it is the supreme direction of us in respect to all duty, which the Pontiff declares to belong to him *sacro approbante concilio;* and this declaration he makes, not as an otiose opinion of the schools, but *cunctis fidelibus credendam et tenendam.*

THE CLAIM TO ABSOLUTE AND ENTIRE OBEDIENCE.

Nor is even the claim of Papal Infallibility the most dangerous of recent usurpations. There is something wider still, and that is the claim to an absolute and entire Obedience. The Third Chapter of the Vatican Constitution has had less attention than the Fourth, but is at least, thinks Mr. Gladstone, of equal moment. Quoting the text of it, he says:

Even, therefore, where the judgments of the Pope do not present the credentials of infallibility, they are unappealable and irreversible, no person may pass judgment upon them, and all men, clerical and lay, dispersedly or in the aggregate, are bound truly to obey them; and from this rule of Catholic truth no man can depart, save at the peril of his salvation. Surely, it is allowable to say that this Third Chapter on universal obedience is a formidable rival to the Fourth Chapter on Infallibility. Indeed, to an observer from without, it seems to leave the dignity to the other, but to reserve the stringency and efficiency to itself. The Third Chapter is the Merovingian Monarch; the fourth is the Carolingian Mayor of the Palace. The third has an overawing splendor; the fourth an iron gripe. Little does it matter to me whether my superior claims infallibility, so long as he is entitled to demand and exact conformity. This, it will be observed, he demands even in cases not covered by his infallibility; cases, therefore, in which he admits it to be possible that he may be wrong, but finds it intolerable to be told so. As he must be obeyed in all his judgments though not *ex cathedra*, it seems a pity he could not likewise

give the comforting assurance that they are all certain to be right.

Why this ostensible reduplication? Why, when faith and morals cover everything worth having in the individual, put forth this other doctrine of Obedience? In this lies the very root and kernel of the matter. "Individual servitude, however abject, will not satisfy the party now dominant in the Latin Church: the State must also be a slave."

The danger herein lurking is energetically dragged from its concealment. The claim to absolute obedience in all things which concern the discipline and government of the Church sweeps into the Papal net whole multitudes of facts, whole systems of governments. And the warning reaches across the Atlantic. Even in the United States, where the severance between Church and State is supposed to be complete, a long catalogue might be drawn of subjects belonging to the domain and competency of the State, but also undeniably affecting the government of the Church; such as, by way of example, marriage, burial, education, prison discipline, blasphemy, poor relief, incorporation, mortmain, religious endowments, vows of celibacy, and obedience. In Europe the circle is far wider, the points of contact and of interlacing almost innumerable. But on all matters, respecting which any Pope may think proper to declare that they concern either faith, or morals, or the Government, or discipline of the Church, he claims, with the approval of a Council undoubtedly Œcumenical in the Roman sense, the absolute obedience, at the peril of salvation, of every member of his Communion.

To such claims as these—the claims of the Syllabus and the Encyclical—it seems not to have been thought wise as yet to pledge the Council. That is probably to come.

In the mean time it is well to remember that this claim in respect to all things affecting the discipline and government of the Church, as well as faith and conduct, is lodged in open day by and in the reign of a Pontiff, who has condemned free speech, free writing, a free press, toleration of nonconformity, liberty of conscience, the study of civil and philosophical matters in independence of the ecclesiastical authority, marriage unless sacramentally contracted, and the definition by the State of the civil rights (*jura*) of the Church; who has demanded for the Church, therefore, the title to define its own civil rights, together with a divine right to civil immunities, and a right to use physical force; and who has also proudly asserted that the Popes of the Middle Ages with their Councils did not invade the rights of princes; as, for example, Gregory VII. of the Emperor Henry IV.; Innocent III. of Raymond of Toulouse; Paul III. in deposing Henry VIII.; or Pius V. in performing the like paternal office for Elizabeth.

WHAT THE CATHOLICS SHOULD DO.

With this spirited passage, Mr. Gladstone approaches the close of his demonstration of his third proposition. Under such circumstances, he thinks it not too much to ask his Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen to clear away the presumptive obligations under which they lie to their ecclesiastical rulers abroad, and to fulfill the engagements into which their Bishop at home entered for them in 1825. Vague assertions will not answer. What is wanted, and that in the most specific form and the clearest terms, Mr. Gladstone takes to be one of two things; that is to say either:

1. A demonstration that neither in the name of faith, nor in the name of morals, nor in the name of the government or discipline of the Church, is the Pope of Rome able, by virtue of the powers asserted for him by the Vatican decree, to make any claim upon those who adhere to his Communion of such a nature as can impair the integrity of their civil allegiance; or else,

2. That if when such a claim is made, it will, even although resting on the definitions of the Vatican, be repelled and rejected, just as Bishop Doyle, when he was asked what the Roman Catholic clergy would do if the Pope intermeddled with their religion, replied frankly, "The consequence would be that we should oppose him by every means in our power, even by the exercise of our spiritual authority."

If explicit assurances to this effect be not given the conclusions must be:

1. That the Pope, authorized by his Council, claims for himself the domain (*a*) of faith, (*b*) of morals, (*c*) of all that concerns the government and discipline of the church.

2. That he in like manner claims the power of determining the limits of those domains.

3. That he does not sever them, by any acknowledged or intelligible line, from the domains of civil duty and allegiance.

4. That he therefore claims, and claims from the month of July, 1870, onwards with plenary authority, from every convert and member of his church, that he shall "place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another," that other being himself.

This demonstration completed, Mr. Gladstone then asks whether, if his propositions be true, they are also material. This, it might be supposed, anybody would concede, but in Mr. Gladstone's answer to his own question occur some of the most suggestive passages of the whole paper. What he really considers is the purpose with which these astounding claims of the Papacy have been put forward. It has been a favorite purpose of his life, he declares, not to conjure up but to conjure down public alarms, and he is not now "going to pretend that either foreign foe or domestic treason can, at the bidding of the Court of Rome, disturb these peaceful shores. But though such fears may be visionary, it is more visionary still to suppose for one moment that the claims of Gregory VII., of Innocent III., and of Boniface VIII., have been disinterred, in the nineteenth century, like hideous mummies picked out of Egyptian sarcophagi, in the interests of archæology, or without a definite and practical aim."

What then is the aim? In part, no doubt, theological, and to attract converts among those who like to discharge their spiritual responsibilities by power of attorney. But this end could have been reached by simpler means, "by a few Tetzels judiciously distributed over Europe." The main purpose must have been political.

THE EFFORT TO REGAIN TEMPORAL POWER.

In other words, Rome is playing a long game to win back the Temporal Power. The mere existence of such an idea Mr. Gladstone regards as a portentous evil, an incentive to general disturbance, though the hope of its success is "ridiculous." It might nevertheless paralyze to some extent the action of such Governments as should interpose, for no purpose of their own, but only for the maintenance of general peace—hence, among other things, its interest to England.

"If the baleful power which is expressed by the phrase *Curia Romana*, and not at all adequately rendered in its historic force by the usual English equivalent, 'Court of Rome,' really entertains the scheme, it doubtless counts on the support in every country of an organized and devoted party, which, when it can command the scales of political power, will promote interference, and, when it is in a minority, will work for securing neutrality. As the peace of Europe may be in jeopardy, and as the duties even of England, as one, so to speak, of its constabulary authorities, might come to be in question, it would be most interesting to know the mental attitude of our Roman Catholic fellow countrymen in England and Ireland with reference to the subject; and it seems to be one on which we are entitled to solicit information."

That the Temporal Power concerns the discipline and government of the church is plain, but anybody who doubts it is referred to Archbishop Manning, who in 1861 "has not thought it too much to say that the civil order of all Christendom is the offspring of the Temporal Power, and has the Temporal Power for its keystone; that on the destruction of the Temporal Power 'the laws of nations would at once fall in ruins;' that (our old friend) the deposing power 'taught subjects obedience and princes clemency,'" and who went even further, and elevated the Temporal Power to the rank of necessary doctrine. He was not then Archbishop, but was made such on the first opportunity, and has since reaffirmed the doctrine with equal or greater emphasis.

THE DUTY OF BRITISH LEGISLATION.

Lastly Mr. Gladstone asks whether he is the man who ought to have set forth these propositions and made this expostulation. For thirty years, he tells us, in office and out, in majorities and in small minorities, he has labored to extend civil rights to his Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen. The Liberal party with which he has acted has suffered in public favor because it was thought too ardent in that effort, and at the same time been in the worst odor at Rome because of its (he hopes) unalterable attachment to Italian liberty and independence. He has at times been the leader of the party, and in justice to it, as well as to society in general, he feels bound now to come forward. Till lately he left the duty of such declarations to others. It was not till 1870 that the change in the position of Roman Catholics as citizens reached its consummation. Till then he had "for very many years felt it to be the first and paramount duty of the British Legislature, whatever Rome might say or do, to give to Ireland all that justice could demand, in regard to matters of conscience and of civil equality, and thus to set herself right in the opinion of the civilized world." But—

When Parliament had passed the Church Act of 1869 and the Land Act of 1870 there remained only, under the great head of Imperial equity, one serious question to be dealt with—that of the higher education. I consider that the Liberal majority in the House of Commons, and the Government to which I had the honor and satisfaction to belong, formally tendered payment in full of this portion of the debt by the Irish University bill of February, 1873. Some indeed think that it was overpaid, a question into which this is manifestly not the place to enter. But the Roman Catholic Prelacy of Ireland thought fit to procure the rejection of that measure, by the direct influence which they exercised over a certain number of Irish members of Parliament, and by the temptation which they thus offered—the bid, in effect, which (to use a homely phrase) they made to attract the support of the Tory opposition.

Their efforts being successful, he felt from that time forward that the situation was changed; that the debt to Ireland having been paid, a debt to the country at large still remained, and on his ceasing to be Prime Minister an appeal from him could no longer run the risk of being misconstrued.

But this is not a recantation nor a regret. Of what the Liberal party has accomplished for the civil equality of Catholics he regrets nothing and recants nothing. He does consider the recent extension of the Catholic hold on the higher classes a political misfortune, albeit "the conquests have been chiefly, as might have been expected, among women." The male converts he prefers to call captives. Too commonly the neophytes adopt the maxim, "A Catholic first, an Englishman afterward." But the movement is limited to the upper classes, the decreasing returns of Roman Catholic marriages proving that in the population as a whole the Roman Catholics have diminished. Yet

There is something at the least abnormal in such a partial growth, taking effect as it does among the wealthy and noble, while the people cannot be charmed, by any incantation, into the Roman camp. The original Gospel was supposed to be meant especially for the poor, but the gospel of the nineteenth century from Rome courts another and less modest destination. If the Pope does not control more souls among us, he certainly controls more acres.

MR. GLADSTONE'S INTENTIONS IN THE FUTURE.

This can be borne, however. There remains the question of general policy. First, as regards the great Imperial settlement, achieved by slow degrees, which has admitted men of all creeds subsisting among us to Parliament, that he conceives to be so determined beyond all doubt or question as to have become one of the deep foundation-stones of the existing Constitution. But there are other matters, important though minor, and upon these, and indeed as the conclusion of the whole question, and of the pamphlet, Mr. Gladstone declares himself in words of great significance and weight.

My summary and extracts have been too copious to leave space for comment. I add only that the appearance at such a moment of such a manifesto seems to me an event of which the importance can scarcely be overrated. Mr. Gladstone is no longer Prime Minister, but he is still the most powerful man in England. He might have remained silent, but he has chosen to come forward at a critical instant to throw all his influence in the scale against Rome in the conflict she is waging, not in England only or mainly, but on the Continent—and elsewhere. Such an act is not done without a clear aim and a careful weighing of consequences, and this pamphlet has, I believe, far more than a mere argumentative purpose. G. W. S.

ENGLISH VIEWS ON THE REPLIES.

LETTERS OF ARCHBISHOP MANNING AND LORD ACTON —THE ONE NULLIFED BY THE OTHER—OPINIONS OF THE ENGLISH AND IRISH PRESS—MR. DISRAELI'S ALLUSION TO THE CONTROVERSY.

LONDON, Nov. 10.—Mr. Gladstone cannot complain that his challenge has not been promptly answered —after one fashion or another. Summaries of his pamphlet appeared in some of the morning papers on Saturday, and on Monday Archbishop Manning's response was published in all of them, followed—in *The Times*—by a long letter from Lord Acton, a Roman Catholic nobleman, to Mr. Gladstone. The Archbishop's letter is a characteristic one, very sounding in phrase but empty of practical assurance, or perhaps I should rather say full of assurances that seem to mean much but which pledge the writer to nothing but glittering generalities. Dr. Manning says he is bound not to suffer a day to pass without repelling from the Catholics of this country the lightest imputation upon their loyalty. He regards Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet as an elaborate argument to prove that the teaching of the Vatican Council renders it impossible for Catholics to be loyal, and to that proposition he gives a prompt contradiction, and with equal promptness affirms that the loyalty of their civil allegiance is not in spite of the teaching of the Catholic Church, but because of it. The sentence is scarcely an adroit one, for it suggests that if the Catholic Church taught the contrary doctrine English Catholics would have to follow that, and their loyalty be exchanged for disloyalty. This of course is not what the Archbishop means us to understand. He says: "The civil allegiance of every Christian man in England is limited by conscience and the law of God, and the civil allegiance of Catholics is limited neither less nor more." But Archbishop Manning, if put on the stand, would have to admit that he does not mean by the words civil allegiance what Mr. Gladstone and Protestants in general mean by them. He has asserted so lately as this present year that the spiritual power can define with a divine certainty its own limits with reference to the civil power; or, in other words, that "the spiritual power knows, with divine certainty, the limits of its own jurisdiction, and it knows therefore the limits and the competence of the civil power." The "civil allegiance," therefore, of which he now makes a boast, is allegiance to the civil power as defined and limited by the spiritual power of Rome —which is precisely what Mr. Gladstone complains of. We have not therefore got a single step further by help of Archbishop Manning's letter. Nor have I stated the whole force of the objection to his declaration. It is certain—admitting for the moment that he means by civil allegiance what Protestants mean by it—that, when he describes it as limited by conscience and the law of God, he means conscience under the guidance of the priest and the law of God as infallibly declared by the Pope. Thus once more we are landed where we started, and find the Archbishop traveling in a vicious circle.

Lord Acton takes a different line, and his letter is interesting, though Lord Acton is not a man who can be said to speak with such authority for lay Catholics as Archbishop Manning does for the sacerdotal order. He is, nevertheless, an important person. He inherited an old baronetcy bestowed in 1644 by Charles I. on the first possessor for distinguished loyalty, and Mr. Gladstone made him a Lord in 1869. He had been educated under Dr. Döllinger, and under his inspiration Lord Acton went to Rome to oppose the adoption by the Œcumenical Council in that year of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility. He has not, so far as I know, been excommunicated, but he must be taken to represent the old Catholic party, which, in England, prefers to be known as Liberal Catholics. He is only 40 years old, and a man of great activity and much influence. His letter is written with marked ability; and it is an endeavor to meet Mr. Gladstone's expostulation by the logical process known as *reductio ad absurdum*. He admits, in substance, that the Papal claim of supremacy in temporal matters is inconsistent with a perfect civil allegiance. But, says Lord Acton, you might have proved a great deal more than you have proved. You might have proved that the doctrine proclaimed by Pope Innocent III., viz., that it is no murder to kill excommunicated persons, is still part of ecclesiastical law. You might have shown that the doctrine that allegiance is not to be kept with heretical princes rests on equal authority; that Pius V., the last canonized Pope, commissioned an assassin to take the life of Queen Elizabeth, and that his successor not only approved the massacre of the French Protestants, but implored the King of France to carry on the work of slaughter till every Huguenot had recanted or perished. A good Catholic is as much bound to accept doctrines and examples of this sort as to accept the recent Vatican decrees. If Lord Acton does not say this in so many words that is plainly what he means. It is the point to which his whole argument tends, and his own position in the Church is well known. Whether, therefore, his argument be a sufficient answer to Mr. Gladstone or not, it is a sufficient answer to Archbishop Manning. The one nullifies the other. Lord Acton maintains his loyalty as an Englishman at the expense of his loyalty as a Catholic.

He does not admit that the Vatican decrees make him any less a good citizen because he does not intend to obey them.

The interest excited by the sudden appearance of Mr. Gladstone's manifesto can hardly be exaggerated. Some of the causes which led to it are stated in the summary I sent you last week, but I had not then heard of the impatience which Mr. Gladstone himself felt to get his views before the world. The last of his manuscript, I am told, was not in Mr. Murray's hands till Wednesday evening, but the pamphlet was sent complete to the London papers on Friday afternoon. It was announced for publication yesterday. Some copies, however, reached the booksellers on Saturday, with "third thousand," on the cover. The copious extracts and abstracts in the newspapers did not make people less eager to have the book itself. In Ireland, the strongest feelings have been aroused, as might be expected, and the expression of them is perhaps stronger still. The London papers, with characteristic heedlessness of what goes on outside the metropolis, gives us the most meager epitomes of what the Irish papers say. Yet the occasion is one which the Irish are sure to regard as most serious. Their fiercest passions will be kindled. I learn from a dispatch in last night's *Pall Mall Gazette* that *The Freeman's Journal* printed the pamphlet in full—which is controversially fair, though Mr. Murray will hardly approve of such a proceeding, nor can it be other than an infringement of copyright. *The Freeman's Journal* has read it with utter dismay, and thinks the spectacle presented by it a pitiful one—that of a great mind dominated by such base passions as ignoble ambition and disappointed spite. This refers, I dare say, to the passage in which the Irish Roman Catholic prelates are held responsible for the defeat of the Irish University bill. Its style is "painfully offensive" to *The Freeman's Journal*, "even to Billingsgate." In one sentence it calls on them to be prepared to guard their liberties, and in the next tells us that the effect of Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet will be his political extinction; in which case nobody's liberties would seem to be in great danger from him. The same correspondent communicates a report that the Irish Roman Catholics will immediately meet to frame an answer to Mr. Gladstone. I have heard the same thing said here in respect to the English Catholics. It is clear they are not left in a satisfactory position by the simultaneous publications of the letters which contradict each other so completely as those of Archbishop Manning and Lord Acton. No fresh Catholic manifestoes appear this morning except one from poor Sir George Bowyer, who, if it were not too unkind, might almost be called the Whalley of the Roman Catholics.

As for the London papers, their reception of the pamphlet is manifestly affected by political considerations. They see that its immediate tendency is to alienate the Catholic wing of the Liberal party. *The Daily News*, which has a good deal of the wisdom of this world, and is not a paper given to enthusiasm on any topic, is more emphatic in expressing its confidence in the loyalty of its Roman Catholic fellow-citizens than in the necessity of this appeal to them. *The Telegraph* thinks it a powerful and well-delivered blow in behalf of the most precious of English possessions, which will be welcomed in every land upon whose institutions the aggressive Roman party makes its open and insidious assaults. *The Standard* admits that it is a polemical triumph, but doubts the practical wisdom of it. *The Pall Mall Gazette*, while regarding the dangers pointed out by Mr. Gladstone as real, is so angry with him for not having discovered them before that it cannot spare him a civil word for calling attention to them now. Its animosity toward the Liberal leader was perhaps never more openly disclosed than at the moment when it describes him as anxious to remedy the mischief he had done by previously encouraging the most intolerable pretensions of the Romish Church. *The Times* speaks of Mr. Gladstone as taking one more bound into space, and complains that he is either very late in his discoveries or very slow to act on his conviction, and that his survey is partial and imperfect. Upon the whole, "we cannot satisfy ourselves that there is any sufficient cause for so prodigious a burst of expostulation." Its comments on the letters of Archbishop Manning and Lord Acton show clearly enough its strong Protestant feeling, but it devoted two other leaders to something very like ridicule of Mr. Gladstone. It even goes so far as to class the late Prime Minister with Mr. Newdegate and Mr. Whalley, who "may now boast a triumvirate of good Protestant champions." The old dislike of the leading journal to Mr. Gladstone proves, in this instance, more powerful than its dislike of Rome. It sees no immediate danger from the latter, and it sees a fair opening for representing Mr. Gladstone as inconsistent, and as reviving an obsolete cry from want of a calm temperament. That way of judging a statesman by the exigencies of to-day, and the resolute disbelief in the day after to-morrow is very English. It is not, I venture to say, upon the considerations *The Times* imputes to him that Mr. Gladstone made up his mind to do so momentous an act.

In Mr. Disraeli's speech at the Lord Mayor's dinner last night, I can discover no allusion to Mr. Gladstone's new stand except a single sentence. He speaks of England as "exhibiting to Europe the example of a State which has solved the great political problem by combining order with liberty, and which, if some of those troubles which are anticipated may occur, will, while it still vindicates the principle of religious liberty, not shrink from proclaiming the principle of religious truth," which means, I judge, that, for the present, Mr. Disraeli thinks opposition to Disestablishment a better cry than No Popery.

G. W. S.

RESULTS OF MR. GLADSTONE'S PAMPHLET.

ADDRESS OF THE POPE.

MR. GLADSTONE COMPARED TO A VIPER—HE HOPES TO ARREST THE LUMINOUS TRIUMPH OF THE CHURCH.

Rome (Nov. 10) Telegram to The London Daily News.

This morning the Pope, who has recovered from his indisposition, after receiving the Bishop of Bucharest, admitted several English Catholics to an audience. In addressing them, he said: "A former Minister of your country, whom I had believed rather moderate, and who, to say the truth, had never while in office manifested arrogance or violence toward the Catholic Church, intoxicated by the proceedings of another Minister in another State, has suddenly come forward, like a viper, assailing this bark of St. Peter. I have not read the book, and I have no great desire to read blasphemies, but from what I understand, the Minister whom they call Liberal flatters the Catholics of that nation and leads them to believe that I wish those subjects to become disloyal to their sovereign and the laws of their country. Puzzled at beholding the vast progress made by that great nation in the path of the true faith, the fallen Minister hopes to arrest the luminous triumph of the Church by interpreting, after his own fashion, the will of this poor Vicar of Christ. A great king (Charlemagne) said that even should the Church impose heavy burdens on the conscience of the population, the Catholics should bear them from their interest in the communion of the Church; but our dogmas, far from being burdens, are light. Those who will walk astray are not Catholics, they are worse than infidels and Protestants, because, calling themselves Catholics, they daily rebel against God and the laws of the Church."

A GERMAN VIEW OF THE CONTROVERSY.

ENGLAND WARNED IS ENGLAND SAVED.

From The Kölnische Zeitung (Liberal).

Certainly Mr. Gladstone need not fear that his fatherland will fail to resist the dangers with which the encroachments of Ultramontanism threaten it, especially in regard to Ireland. England warned is England saved. A few years ago she seemed to be in a state of repose, indifferent to all the machinations that the Roman Curia might make; but now both parties in the country that take the helm of State by turns agree to the acknowledgment that it is necessary to keep one's eyes open in order not to be surprised by the stealthy progress and dark workings of this power.

COMMMENTS OF THE BRITISH PRESS.

END OF ECCLESIASTICAL ALLIANCES OF POLITICAL PARTIES.

From The London Daily News (Liberal.)

There is one probable effect of Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet which has not yet been much discussed, and which is likely, perhaps, to abide when beyond these voices of present polemic there is peace. We mean the effect it must have in breaking up what we may call the ecclesiastical alliances of political parties. So far as the Roman Catholics and the Liberal party are concerned, Mr. Gladstone's present attitude seems to dissolve the alliance completely, and to leave individual Catholics free to range themselves, according to their inclination, with either party or outside both. Even when the indignation, rising sometimes, as Mr. Gladstone himself says, to fury, with which Roman Catholics received his now famous words, shall have cooled, we must expect, of course, that the Catholic body will recognize the fact that they have not, as Catholics, any necessary confederation any longer with the Liberals of this country.

MR. GLADSTONE SHOULD APPEAL FROM THE OPINION OF ENGLAND TO THAT OF GERMANY.

From The London Standard (Conservative).

If Pius IX. is offended with Mr. Gladstone, the Bismarckians of Germany are delighted. It was sure to be so. On a celebrated occasion Mr. Gladstone appealed from the opinion of the metropolis to the opinion of the provinces. We presume he will now appeal from the opinion of England to the opinion of Germany. The National Liberals of that country are enchanted with his pamphlet. This is not unnatural. Still, are they not almost as inconsistent in their admiration as Mr. Gladstone is in the lame and impotent conclusion of his expostulation? Mr. Gladstone expostulates; but if he is not listened to, he will do nothing but what he would do if he were listened to. His conduct in the future is strictly to resemble his conduct in the past.

MR. GLADSTONE LIKELY TO BE CHARGED WITH HYPOCRISY.

From The Freeman's Journal (Catholic).

Mr. Gladstone saw the "crime" of the Catholic Church committed in 1870; but he condoned it until 1874. In the mean time he held office, and was supported in power by the Catholic representatives of Catholic constituencies. During that time he detected no flaw in their citizenship or allegiance. Was he "willing to wound and yet afraid to strike," or did the enormities of Catholicity only appear to him when its professors had justly helped to depose him? We fear a charge of hypocrisy in the first place and of vindictiveness in the next lies against the ex-Premier. For his accusations in the matter of "civil allegiance," and the necessary disloyalty of Catholics, we need only point to the history of the past and the facts of the present to make it clear that Mr. Gladstone evolved this astounding proposition from the fullness of an imagination marked of late by flighty and erratic volitions. On what occasions have Catholics been wanting in their allegiance? If we look at home we find the Catholic clergy the guardians and preservers of peace and order, when the operation of bad laws might well have driven their flocks into rebellion. If we survey history, we see Catholics sacrificing everything for their attachment to legitimacy—to their loyalty, in fact. Of course they have been, and we trust to Heaven ever will be, hostile to coercive laws and treacherous statesmen.

THE NEW TRIBUNE BUILDING.

The new Tribune Building, now in course of erection, occupies the historic site of THE TRIBUNE, on the corner of Spruce and Nassau-sts., one of the most important central points in the City of New-York and the most eligible location on Manhattan Island for a great newspaper office. The new Tribune Building will be the largest newspaper office in the world, and will contain more than four times the space of any other printing-house in the city. When complete it will front 91 feet on Printing-House-square, 100 feet on Spruce-st., and will extend through to Frankfort-st., a clear depth of 168 feet, and with a front of 29 feet on the street last named. Only a portion of the building, that fronting on Printing-House-square, 91 feet, and on Spruce-st., 52 feet, is now erecting, and this will be so far completed as to allow its occupation by THE TRIBUNE before the remaining section is begun. In this front building, as well as the completed structure, will be a cellar, basement, and nine stories, excluding the attic. On Printing-House-square, above huge foundations, laid in with granite bond-plates and cap-stones, a majestic tower will rise nearly 260 feet. The main entrance will be in the front of this tower, which, from the starting point of the foundation, 25 feet below the sidewalk level, to the top of the finial, will measure 285 feet. The hights of the stories are as follows: First story, corner office (to be used as THE TRIBUNE counting-room), 21 feet, with a rise of 18 inches above the curb at the intersection of Nassau and Spruce-sts.; first story, office north of main entrance, floor 8 feet 6 inches above the curb 14 feet high; second, 12 feet 6 inches; third, 12 feet; fourth, 11 feet 6 inches; fifth, 11 feet; sixth, 10 feet 9 inches; seventh, 10 feet 6 inches; eighth (composing-room), 20 feet, and ninth, 10 feet. From the curbstone to the eaves at the top of the outside wall of the west (Spruce-st.) front will measure 106 feet; the roof is a Mansard, with peaked top, and rises about 40 feet from the eaves to the top of the peak, making the hight from curb to peak on the main front 146 feet. On the Spruce-st. side the decline of the curb is about five feet, so that the hight at the south-eastern corner will be over 150 feet. Sixty feet from the curb, the tower is corbeled out, projecting from the face of the wall 2 feet 6 inches, and this projection is continued to the top of the masonry of the tower, 196 feet above the curb. At the hight of 150 feet a little balcony appears on the front of the tower, and from this the national flag will be displayed on suitable occasions. One hundred and sixty-seven feet from the ground will be an immense clock with four dials each 12 feet in diameter, which will be illuminated at night. The figures on the dials are to be cut in granite and gilded. The inside facing will be of plate glass, through which the light from within will display the figures. The tower will be four-sided, and at the point where it rises above the roof will be 17 feet square. It will be of solid masonry to the hight of 196 feet from the curb, and above that point will be of iron covered with slate, rising 64 feet higher. In the lower part of this spire will be four arched openings to be reached by a staircase, and from these far-reaching views of the city, the bay, and all the surrounding country about may be obtained.

The construction of the building is of the most substantial and enduring kind, such as shall insure its standing for ages a fit memorial of the great Founder of THE TRIBUNE, and a perpetual testimony to the success of the great journal into which he breathed the breath of life. The foundation walls rest upon a concrete bed 10 feet wide and 18 inches thick, composed of Portland cement, sand, gravel, and stone, a composition novel in this city, and hardening very quickly into extreme solidity. Upon this concrete is a continued course of granite slabs 18 inches thick, and varying from 10 feet to 6 feet 6 inches in width. Under the piers of the front and the tower walls are other granite slabs over these, some of which weigh more than 10 tons. Upon these granite courses the brick work rests. The piers of the front are of so-called Croton pavers' brick, laid in Portland cement, with granite bond-stones 10 inches thick. The inner walls are of Haverstraw brick, laid in Rosendale cement On the level of the basement floor starts the granite work of the front extending in solid blocks, bond-

ing alternately through the whole depth of the piers to the second story. Baltimore front brick, laid in black mortar, will be the chief material above the second-story level. The trimmings of the first story will be of Quincy granite, and of the others, white granite. Windows, cornices, and towers will also have heavy granite trimmings. The solid character of the structure is shown by the thickness of the walls, which, beginning at the street level in the first story, will be 5 feet 2 inches thick, diminishing gradually to 2 feet 8 inches at the eaves. The north end south tower walls are to be 4 feet thick to the level of the main cornice, then 3 feet 2 inches to the level of the eaves of the tower roof. The main piers, window piers, and jambs are each to have a reveal of 13 inches. The intervening space between the pilasters, of which there are five, or the western and southern fronts respectively, is 16 feet. Geometrical designs in white, black, and red brick will vary the appearance of the exterior, and a row of small granite columns extending around the entire front, on three streets, will make an imposing feature of the seventh story.

The excellence of the interior of the building will fully equal the merits of its exterior. First among its claims to praise is the fact that it is absolutely fire-proof in every part. All floor beams will be of iron, supported only by solid masonry. The floors will be of tile, and the partitions of tile or plaster of Paris. Not a single cast-iron column will be used as a support. The stairways will be of fire-proof material, and will be built in substantial masonry, and the elevators will be thoroughly protected. As the roof is entirely covered with slate, no danger need be looked for from that quarter. The arrangements for light, heat, and ventilation will be unequaled. All the offices, halls, and staircases will be lighted from the outside, and in every room a direct supply of fresh air will be furnished through openings beneath the window-sills. The heating will be by steam. Three elevators will give easy access to every story, and the whole building will be supplied with every device for comfort and beauty. The main entrance, 9 feet wide and 18 feet 6 inches high, is flanked on either hand with massive columns of highly polished granite. Lining and finishings of granite in the vestibule will correspond to the outside, and the ceiling will be vaulted in groined arches with Baltimore brick. On either hand, as the vestibule is entered, will be seen large directories guiding to the numerous offices in the building.

South of the main portal and entirely distinct from it will be the entrance to THE TRIBUNE counting-room. Just within the doorway will be placed a life-size statue of Mr. Greeley of marble or bronze, the material for the work not having been decided. THE TRIBUNE counting-room will be 20 feet in width, and occupy the whole front on Spruce-st. It will be admirably fitted and provided with pneumatic and speaking-tubes, electric annunciators, and other means of communication with the editorial rooms. These will be in the seventh story, and the compositors' room in the eighth, till the entire building is finished, when the editorial rooms will be in the lofty eighth story—which has a hight of 20 feet—on the Park front, and the composing-room, stereotype-room and proof-room will be in the rear of the same story, running from Spruce to Frankfort-st. With the exceptions of these portions of the building and the basement room looking on Spruce-st., which will be also used by THE TRIBUNE, the entire building, from the ample bankers' office in the basement to the eighth story, will be for rent for professional tenants. No manufacturing business of any kind will be admitted to the front building. In the basement and first story of this building there will be handsome bankers' offices, 45x27 feet, north of the main entrance. The rest of the available space on the first story will be taken up by the counting-room. On each of the floors above, to the eigth, there will be seven eligible apartments, provided with every convenience.

When the front building is finished, THE TRIBUNE will remove into it from its present quarters, which, with the other structures on the estate, will be immediately demolished, and the building of the rest of the edifice will be pushed forward rapidly. Richard M. Hunt of this city is the architect. The mason work is done by Peter T. O'Brien of this city, and the cut-stone work by James G. Batterson of Hartford.

THE NEW-YORK TRIBUNE is beyond a doubt the most influential, fearless, and independent paper in the country. It never enters the field of startling sensations, but gives the news and discusses all public subjects in a spirit of candor and honesty.—[Great Barrington (Mass.) Courier (Administration Republican.)

"CHEAPEST AND BEST."

A STANDARD NOVEL FOR TEN CENTS.

THE TRIBUNE series of Standard Works of Fiction, begun less than a year ago, has proved a great success. In the essential qualities of real merit and cheapness no other novel publication in the world can compare with THE TRIBUNE "Extra" series. To any regular subscribers to THE SEMI-WEEKLY TRIBUNE who lose one or more numbers containing installments of the Novel while in course of publication, its reissue is a great advantage, enabling them to obtain the work complete at a merely nominal sum. Four Novel "Extras," containing the following standard and popular fictions are now ready:

No. 1. LORDS AND LADIES. Price 10 cents.

No. 2. { MAY, by Mrs. OLIPHANT. / EPISODE OF FIDDLETOWN. } —Price 10 cents.

No. 3. A PAIR OF BLUE EYES. Price 10 cents.

No. 4. THE WOOING O' T. Price 20 cents.

Either of the above sent by mail, postpaid, to any address in the United States on receipt of price. Address

THE TRIBUNE, New-York.

THE CROWNING WORK OF A LIFE.—The complete series of Cambridge Lectures by Prof. Louis Agassiz, on THE METHOD OF CREATION, in which are given his latest answer to the Development Theory of Darwin, and his best argument against the materialistic tendencies of the age, is published in full in THE TRIBUNE EXTRA No. 8. In these memorable Lectures Prof. Agassiz gave to the scientific world the ripest fruit of his years of study, research, and observation on the conflict between Science and Christianity. TRIBUNE EXTRA No. 8 contains the entire series without curtailment. Price by mail, postpaid to any address in the United States, 10 cents. Address

THE TRIBUNE, New-York.

THE GREAT FAMILY NEWSPAPER.

THE NEW-YORK TRIBUNE,

Which publishes all the news.

Which is honest and independent in all things.

Which instructs and educates its readers at the same time that it gives them the news.

Which reports the best thoughts and opinions of leading men, as well as the actions of others.

Which brought the first news to the American public of the surrender by the Spanish authorities of the steamer Virginius to the United States, a TRIBUNE correspondent having been the only civilian present and witnessing the ceremony of transfer, and the first messenger to announce the fact to the Admiral in command of our Gulf squadron.

Which surpassed all other papers, secular and religious, in its reports of the proceedings of the Evangelical Alliance, at its meeting in New-York, in October, 1873, publishing daily from 18 to 24 columns, in all 32 pages, closely filled with the narrative of the Alliance meetings—an achievement in journalism for which THE TRIBUNE received the formal thanks of the Alliance and the compliments of the religious press of the country.

Which gave a complete and adequate account of the transactions of the American Association for the Advancement of Science at its recent annual meeting at Hartford, Conn., and republished the same in a TRIBUNE Extra Sheet.

Which published entire Agassiz's great series of lectures on the Method of Creation, being a conclusive scientific answer to the Darwinian theory.

Which has reported fully and faithfully, during the past year, the lectures of Tyndall on Light; of John Weiss on Shakespeare; of Wendell Phillips on Art; of Profs. Proctor and Young on Astronomy; of Brown-Séquard on the Nerves; of Huxley on the Origin of Life; of Prof. Youmans on Science, and of Bret Harte, Parton, and Mark Twain, on lighter subjects.

Which published Beecher's Yale theological lectures in full—eleven practical sermons to young ministers.

Which has the most complete and intelligent foreign correspondence of any paper in the United States.

Which carries on no quarrels with its rivals, and excludes mere personal issues from its columns, devoting the space thus rescued to news and more important matters.

Which recognizes agriculture as the foremost industry of the country, and prints more information of value to the farmers of the country than any other daily paper, if not more than any agricultural paper.

Which admits no impure or immoral advertisements to its columns, nor publishes anything which is not befitting a refined family circle.

Which is always the first, fullest, and most trustworthy in its news, sparing neither money, effort, nor exertion to supply its readers complete information of every important event.

Which was never so prosperous and flourishing as at the present time, and which is erecting the finest newspaper office in the world.

A LIBRARY FOR ONE DOLLAR—V

Illustrations.—Literature, Art, Science, History, and Re
Discussion.—The Fifteen Tribune Extra Sheets, containing:

Extra No. 1.—Illustrated.—Tyndall's six Lectures on Light. 10 cents.

Extra No. 2.—Beecher's Compulsory Education; Fields's Mast the Situation; Phillips's Lost Arts: Bellows's Is There a God? Twain's Sandwich Island Letters. Price, 10 cents.

Extra No. 3.—Illustrated.—Prof. Wilder's Brain and Mind; Barker's Chemical Discoveries of the Spectroscope; Prof. Y Astronomical Conquests: Prof. Young's Present Knowledge of th Price, 10 cents.

Extra No. 4.—Six Shakespearean Studies, by John Weiss; sev Studies, National Academy Course; Parton's Pilgrim Fathers as M Business; Bret Harte's Argonauts of '49. Price, 10 cents.

Extra No. 5.—Illustrated.—Three Lectures by Prof. Louis El on Sound and Hearing, Voice and Speech, and the Explanat Musical Harmony; Prof. Benj. Silliman's Deep Placer Mining i ifornia; Dr. R. W. Raymond on The Seven Senses; Parke Godw True and False Science; Prof. E. L. Youmans on The Limits of Sc Price, 10 cents.

Extra No. 6.—Beecher's Seven Lectures for Ministers: Thoug Ministers—Thoughts upon Prayer—Prayer-Meeting As It Is—The Prayer-Meeting—Music in Churches—Society in the Church—Th gers of the Church. Price, 10 cents.

Extra No. 7.—Beecher's concluding Lectures: Revivals in the C —Religious Awakenings—Thoughts on Revivals—A Religious E ence. Also, "The Moravian Church," by de Schweinitz; " Statements," by Thomas Starr King; "The Death Menace," by E and a "History of Sectarian Appropriations." Price, 10 cents.

Extra No. 8.—The Method of Creation—Twelve Lectures by Agassiz, concerning Animal Life.—Vestiges of Antiquity, showi similarity of the remains of earlier races in the Eastern and W Hemispheres, by Dr. Le Plongeon—The Fossil Man of Mentone, trated—The Art of Dyeing, a lecture by Prof. Chandler—The W Ages Past, an illustrated description of the wonderful Fossils disc in the Rocky Mountains by the Yale College Expeditions under Marsh. Price, 10 cents.

Extra No. 9.—Illustrated.—Six Lectures on Astronomy by Ri A. Proctor, and Lectures by Prof. Agassiz at the Anderson Scho Penikese Island. Price, 10 cents. (Pamphlet Edition, 20 cents.)

Extra No. 10.—Illustrated.—Science for 1873.—Proceeding Discussions of the Annual Meeting of the American Associati the Advancement of Science, at Portland.—Letters on Deep Sea I ing, illustrated. Price 10 cents.

Extra No. 14.—Exploring Expeditions—Prof. Agassiz's six Le on the Valley of the Amazon (delivered in New-York in 1867, and published in complete form for the first time)—New Route t Yellowstone Park (Capt. Jones's Expedition of 1873)—The U States Surveying Expedition to the Rocky Mountains during (Letters by Prof. W. D. Whitney of Yale College, and Dr. F. V. Ha Chief Geologist in charge of the Expedition). Price, 10 cents.

Extra No. 15.—Discoveries on the site of Ancient Troy (Lett Bayard Taylor)—Brown-Séquard's six Lectures on the Nerves— tor's four Farewell Lectures on Astronomy. Price, 10 cents. (phlet Edition, 20 cents.)

Extra No. 17.—Metropolitan Sermons—Reports of Sermons b principal preachers of all denominations in New-York, Brooklyn Jersey City. Price, 10 cents. (Pamphlet Edition, 20 cents.)

Extra No. 18.—Sumner Eulogies: Senator Schurz's Great Spee Boston—Congress Tributes—Congressman Elliott's Speech. Pri cents.

Extra No. 19.—Meeting of the National Academy of Scienc Washington, April, 1874: Have We Two Brains? Dr. C. E. B Séquard; Effects of Alcohol, Surgeon-General Hammond; Longfe J. T. Fields; Wheeler's Western Surveys; The Transit of Venu Price, 10 cents. (Pamphlet Edition, 20 cents.)

Extra No. 20.—Metropolitan Sermons (Second Series.) Pric cents. (Pamphlet Edition 20 cents.)

Tribune Extras, Nos. 8, 10, and 14, inclusive, will be sent by to any address in the United States for 25 cents; Nos. 1 to 9 incl or Nos. 6, 7, 8, 10, and 12; or Nos. 8, 10, 12, and 14; or Nos. 5, 6, 8, 10, and 14, will be sent to any address for 50 cents.

☞ The entire extra series above described sent by mail for $1.

Extra No. 12.—The Evangelical Alliance Extra (thirty-two pages cents.

Extra No. 21.—One Year of Science. Illustrated. Coggia's Biela's Comets; Chemistry's Centennial; American Science Associ and Philological Convention at Hartford. Twelve pages of Tribun —price 10 cents. (Pamphlet Edition, 96 pages, 25 cents.)

Extra No. 22.—Bayard Taylor's Letters from Egypt and Icelan sheet form only)—Price 10 cents.

Extra No. 23.—Tyndall on Science and Religion; Huxley o Origin of Life; Owen on Man's Earliest History; President Mc Reply to Tyndall. Price 10 cents. (Pamphlet edition, 20 cents.)

Extra No. 25.—The Gladstone Controversy; The Vatican De Replies by Archbishop Manning and Lord Acton. Price 10 (Pamphlet edition, 20 cents.)

Address THE TRIBUNE, New-Y

* The trade supplied by the News Companies in New-York, and Shepard & Co., Boston.

GTU Library
3 2400 00590 8854

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500
All items are subject to recall